THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositorytimes0002revj

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDITED BY THE

REV. JAMES HASTINGS, M.A.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E 965
T 582
47.380

VOLUME THE SECOND,

October 1890 – September 1891.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, . . SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO., LIMITED.
,, . . JOHN HEYWOOD.
MANCHESTER, . JOHN HEYWOOD.
LIVERPOOL, . . PHILIP, SON, AND NEPHEW.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

AUTHORS.

	PAGE
Rev. W. J. Adams, D.C.L.,	244, 276
Rev. A. B. D. Alexander, M.A.,	140
Rev. R. Balgarnie, D.D.,	80
Rev. Professor J. S. Banks,	179, 233
M. H. Bannerman,	47
Rev. L. L. Barclay, B.A.	117
Rev. Professor J. Agar Beet, D.D.,	85, 161, 211
Rev. Professor W. H. Bennett, M.A.,	63
Edward Henry Blakeney,	117
Rev. R. Masson Boyd, M.A.,	44
Rev. Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D.,	18
Rev. Professor G. G. Cameron, D.D.,	137
Rev. Canon T. K. Cheyne, D.D.,	202, 224, 248
Rev. John S. Clemens, B.A.,	140
Rev. Charles Connor,	261
Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, LL.D.,	156, 182
Rev. Professor W. T. Davison, M.A.,	16, 65, 173
Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D.,	211
Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, B.A.,	282
Rev. R. C. Ford, M.A.,	181
Rev. J Gaskell,	118
Rev. Alfred Gill, B.A.,	93, 165
Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.,	101
Rev. P. J. Gloag, D.D.,	42
Rev. W. Glynne, M.A.,	71
Professor H. Graetz, D.D.,	277
Rev. W. A. Gray, M.A.,	68
Rev. A. B. Grosart, D.D., LL.D.,	36, 107, 180
Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, M.A., B.D.,	133
Rev. Principal Elmer Harding, M.A.,	15, 61, 161, 235
George Henderson,	180
Rev. Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, B.D.,	85, 210
Rev. A. Hampden Lee,	180
Rev. J. P. Lilley, B.D.,	84
Rev. Professor. J. Rawson Lumby, D.D.,	62
W. T. Lynn, B.A., F.R.A.S.,	11, 273
Rev. Principal J. B. M'Clellan, M.A.,	64, 101, 184
Rev. F. M'Kenzie, M.A.,	93
Rev. Professor J. T. Marshall, M.A.,	211
Rev. Professor Allan Menzies, D.D.,	85
Rev. Professor R. Waddy Moss,	23, 63, 274
Rev. Principal H. C. G. Moule, M.A.,	78, 211
F. J. Pakenham,	80
Rev. Principal Alfred Plummer, D.D.,	81, 179
Rev. John Porteous, M.A., B.D.,	46
Rev. Principal R. Rainy, D.D.,	5
Rev. Professor Marshall Randles, D.D.,	63, 156
Rev. F. H. Ringwood, LL.D.,	76
Rev. Professor R. Rothe, D.D.,	45, 163, 246
Rev. John Rutherfurd, B.D.,	181
Rev. Professor Herbert E. Ryle, M.A.,	138, 149, 197, 269
Rev. Professor S. D. F. Salmond, D.D.,	42, 125
Rev. James Scott, D.D.,	114
Rev. R. Scott, M.A.,	106, 110
Rev. J. A. Selbie, M.A.,	39
Rev. Principal D. W. Simon, D.D.,	221
Rev. John Smith, M.A.,	214
Very Rev. H. D. M. Spence, D.D.,	84
Rev. R. M. Spence, M.A.,	255
Rev. Edward Spurrier,	164
Rev. Professor H. B. Swete, D.D.,	209
Rev. E. Abbey Tindall,	86
Rev. C. Watt-Smyrk,	164
Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe, M.A.,	76
Rev. Professor Owen C. Whitehouse, M.A.,	23
Rev. F. H. Woods, B.D.,	102
Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Worcester,	54
Rev. A. H. Wratislaw, M.A.,	115
Rev. Arthur Wright, M.A.,	43
Rev. Professor R. N. Young, D.D.,	43

SUBJECTS.

	PAGE
Apocalypse, Literature,	156, 182, 232
Apologetics, Recent Literature,	130, 153
Art and Religion,	13, 283
Assyrian Cosmogony,	197
Atonement, Ritschl's Doctrine,	6
Baalzephon,	23
Baptism, Christian,	195
Babylonian Paradise,	270
Browning's Argument for the Incarnation,	96
Carlyle and Goethe,	47
Cats,	20
Christianity, Early,	194
Christian Ministry,	276
Christian Women's Education Union,	46
Christian Writers, Early,	61

	PAGE
Christ's Human Knowledge,	123
Commentary, The Great Text,	12, 33, 59, 78, 104, 135, 158, 161, 189, 212, 235, 259, 279
Conscience, Seared,	242
Cosmogony, Assyrian,	197
Courage,	237
Creation, Days,	29, 197
,, of the Universe,	149
Creationism,	156
Criticism, German,	1
,, Higher,	51, 121, 147, 172, 193, 218
Delitzsch, Franz,	147, 171
Deluge,	49
Demoniacal Possession,	239
Eden,	146, 269
Ephesians, Literature,	85
Etham,	23
Ethics, Literature,	179
Evolution, Literature,	85
Exposition, Notes of Recent,	1, 25, 49, 73, 97, 121, 145, 169, 193, 217, 241, 265
Faith,	159
Fall, Babylonian Legend	271
Fool,	42
Foresight and Insight,	48
Gadara, Gerasa, Gergesa,	73, 121
Genesis, Early Narratives,	62, 149, 197, 269
Gladstone on the Gerasene Miracle,	49, 73, 101, 121
Gospels, Origin.	25
Greek, How to Learn,	179
Guild of Bible Study,	1, 12, 63, 70, 83, 111, 139, 162, 188, 211, 241, 259, 267
Harper, President,	96
Hatch, Edwin,	5
Hebrews, Literature,	15
Hofmann,	171
Holiness,	4
Hope,	159
Humour of our Lord,	36, 107
Huxley on the Gerasene Miracle,	49, 73, 101, 121
Illustrations,	14, 35, 48, 60, 79, 95, 105, 137, 159, 191, 213, 237, 256, 260, 281, 284
Index to Modern Sermons,	19, 69, 112, 165
Inspiration and Modern Criticism,	54, 173
,, Literature,	179
,, Verbal,	42
Intermediate State,	52, 99
International Lessons, Exposition,	21, 40, 66
Jericho, Fall,	50
Jerusalem,	122
Jewish Ethical Wills,	219
John's Epistles, Recent Literature,	231
,, Gospel, Authenticity,	146
,, ,, Recent Literature,	229
Keswick Teaching,	4
Klostermann,	193, 218, 279
Leprosy,	26
Life and Immortality,	95
Lightfoot, Bishop,	5
Literature of the Month,	24, 47, 71, 94, 118, 141, 166, 191, 215, 239, 263
Lord's Prayer,	184, 242, 254, 255
Lord's Supper, Literature,	84
Love,	160
Mark, Vernacular in,	133
Melchizedek,	170
Messianic Doctrine,	125
Migdol,	23
Newman, Cardinal,	2
Old Testament Versions,	193, 210
Paradise,	269
Paul's Thorn in the Flesh,	98
Peshitto,	210
Potter and Clay,	274
Preaching, Literature,	53
,, Personal Element,	27
Priest, Ancient Jewish,	244, 276
Prophecy, Messianic,	147
,, ,, Ethical Theory,	95
Prophets, Religious Doctrine,	124
Purgatory,	52
Recreation,	13
Red Sea, Place of Crossing,	23
Religion, Literature of Comparative,	42
Requests and Replies,	23, 42, 84, 137, 156, 179
Ritschl,	5
Rock and Stone,	243
Romans, Literature,	161
Sacrifice,	3
Samuel (First), Literature,	235
Seared Conscience,	242
Septuagint,	210
,, Origin,	145, 209, 277
Sermon on the Mount,	107
Sermons, American,	28
,, Index to Modern,	19, 69, 112, 165
,, Notable, of the Month,	144, 192, 216, 240
,, Recent Literature in,	87
Serpent Tempter,	271
Son of Man,	127
Spirit (Holy) in Individuals,	76, 180
Stephen,	120
Stirling, Dr. Hutchison,	4
Targums,	210
Tobit, Book,	220
Traducianism,	156
Vernacular in St. Mark,	133
Vulgate,	210
Words, Study,	97
Zoroastrian Influence on the Religion of Israel,	202, 224, 248

HEBREW AND GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE
אֱלֹהִים,	62
בֹּהוּ,	244
מֶלֶךְ,	209
נֶפֶשׁ,	52
צִוָּה,	220
צִרְעָה,	27
קֶבֶר,	52
רוּחַ,	115
שָׁאוּל,	52
ἀγορά,	39
ἅδης,	52
ἄρχων,	209, 277
βάρος,	97
βασιλεύς,	209, 277
βοανεργές,	134
διαιρέσις,	59
ἐὰν μή,	53
ἐγγύς,	2, 3
ἐπιγινώσκειν,	135
ἐπιούσιον,	184, 242, 254, 255
τὰ ἐπουράνια,	140
ἐριθεία,	97
ἐφφαθά,	134
ζωή,	64, 65
θυμιατήριον,	18
θυσία, θύω,	3
κενοδοξία,	97
κορβάν,	134
λέπρα,	27
μωρί,	42
ναός,	76
παρρησία, πεποίθησις, πίστις,	4, 76
πνεῦμα,	101
ποιεῖν,	34
σῶμα,	77
ταλιθὰ κοῦμι,	134
ὑποπιάζω,	109
φορτίον,	97
φρόνημα,	27
ψυχή,	64, 65

BOOKS.

	PAGE
Abbot's Scientific Atheism,	131
,, Way Out of Agnosticism,	131
Ahlfeld's Voice from the Cross,	87
Aitchison's Signa Christi,	155
Alexander's Epistles of St. John,	231
Beet's Ephesians to Philemon,	94
,, Fernley Lecture,	131
Behrends' Philosophy of Preaching,	27
Bernard's Mental Characteristics of the Lord Jesus Christ,	155
Blake's How to Read Isaiah,	215
Brace's Unknown God,	153
Bright's Three Great Fathers,	118
Brown's Apocalypse,	232, 233
,, Great Day of the Lord,	232
,, Sabbath,	215
Campbell's Studies in St. Luke,	239
Carpenter's Bampton Lectures,	156
,, First Three Gospels,	71
Cave's Battle of the Standpoints,	123

PAGE

Cheyne's Bampton Lectures, . 193
Conte's Evolution, . . . 132
Cook's Boston Monday Lectures, 130, 154
Crosby's Seven Churches of Asia, ... 3, 88
Curtiss' Franz Delitzsch, . . 148
Dale's The Living Christ, . . 154
Davies' Order and Growth, . 240
Davies' Talks with Men, . . 141
Dawson's Modern Ideas of Evolution, ... 132
Deane's Pseudepigrapha, . . 239
Delitzsch's Isaiah, . . 16, 194
,, Messianic Prophecies, 147, 172
Dimock's Person of Christ, . 119
Dods' Gospel of St. John, . . 258
Döllinger's Declarations and Letters, ... 179
Douglas' Obadiah to Zephaniah, 72
Doupanloup's Ministry of Preaching, ... 53
Drummond's Pax Vobiscum, . 110
Drysdale's Early Bible Songs, . 113
Ebrard's Apologetics, . . 130
Exell's Biblical Illustrator, 72, 119, 142, 229, 258
Findlay's Thessalonians, . . 239
Fisher's Revelation, . . . 154
Fyfe's Hereafter, . . . 51
Garland's Apocalypse, . 118, 232
Gibbon's Eternal Life, . . 258
Gladden's Burning Questions, . 130
Gladstone's Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture, . . . 29
Gloag's Introduction to the Johannine Writings, . 146, 228
Graetz's History of the Jews, . 267
Green's Bible Teacher, . . 216
Grosart's Hymns, . . 142, 216
Hall's Gethsemane, . . . 119
Harden's Shall All be made Alive? 143
Harris' Old Testament Scriptures, ... 71
Harris' Self-Revelation of God, 153
Harvest Thanksgiving Services, . 92
Hatch's Hibbert Lectures, . . 194
,, Memorials, . . . 88
Hunter's After the Exile, . . 39
Inglis' Bible Illustrations, . . 155
Iverach's St. Paul, . . . 119
Jeffrey's Salvation of the Gospel, 91
Johnson's Vision of the Ages, . 232
Jones' Browning as a Philosophical and Religious Teacher, 283
Jones' Welsh Pulpit of To-day, . 87
Kennedy's Unity of Isaiah, . 240
Kirkpatrick's Psalms, . 215, 250
Knox-Little's Christian Home, . 264
Lane's Life of Vinet, . 48, 96
Lang's Gideon and the Judges, . 119

PAGE

Lechler's Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times, ... 228
Lias's First Epistle of St. John, . 231
Liddon's Magnificat, . . . 90
Lightfoot's Leaders in the Northern Church, ... 91
Lightfoot's Ordination Addresses, 91, 97
Lilley's Lord's Supper, . . 141
Luckock's Intermediate State, . 100
Lux Mundi, . . . 130, 234
Lynn's Scripture Characters, . 216
MacArthur's Calvary Pulpit, 28, 88
M'Cosh's Gospel Sermons, . 92
,, Evolution, . . . 132
MacEvilly's Gospel of St. John, . 229
M'Laren's Holy of Holies, 58, 87
Maclear's Holy Eucharist, . . 155
M'Neill's Regent Square Pulpit, Vol ii., ... 92
Marsh's Words to Christian Workers, ... 215
Martineau's Seat of Authority, 2, 125
,, Study of Religion, . 131
Matheson's Gospel and Modern Substitutes, ... 154
Matheson's Spiritual Development of St. Paul, . . 98
Mathews' Witness of the World to Christ, ... 153
Milligan's Revelation of St. John, 232
,, Book of Revelation, . 232
Moinet's Great Alternative, . 89
Moorhouse's Teaching of Christ, . 239
Morison's Sheaves of Ministry, . 89
Moule's Justifying Righteousness, 142
,, Thoughts on the Spiritual Life, ... 3
Newnham's Alresford Essays, . 264
Nicoll's Life of Elmslie, . 24, 88
Orelli's Isaiah, ... 194
,, Old Testament Prophecy, 172
Owen's Letter of the Larger Hope, ... 119
Paget's Faculties and Difficulties, 90
,, Spirit of Discipline, . 142
Parkhurst's Blind Man's Creed, . 87
Pearse's Elijah the Man of God, . 142
Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit, ... 215
Perowne's Galatians, . . . 71
Philip's Why am I a Christian? . 119
Plummer's SS. James and Jude, 141
,, Epistles of St. John, . 231
,, Gospel of St. John, . 229
Presbyterian Forms of Service, . 214
Present Day Tracts, . 131, 153, 154
Pritchard's Thoughts of an Astronomer, ... 163
Rand's Sermon Register, . . 215
Rankin's Creed in Scotland, . 119
Rawlinson's Isaac and Jacob, . 119
Reith's St. John's Gospel, . . 229

PAGE

Reusch's Nature and the Bible, . 154
Riehm's Messianic Prophecy, . 282
Roberts's Letter from Heaven, . 93
Romans Dissected, . . . 264
Ross's Lord's Prayer, . . . 72
Rowe's Zacchæus, . . . 215
Sadler's Epistles of SS. James, John, Peter, and Jude, . . 258
Sadler's S. John's Gospel, . . 229
Sanday's Oracles of God, 122, 142, 264
Schleiermacher's Sermons, . . 88
Schürer's Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, . 74, 141
Scott's Life of Abraham, . . 44
Sedgwick's Life and Letters, . 2
Sell's Church in History, . 119, 155
Simcox's Revelation of St. John, 182, 232
,, Writers of the New Testament, ... 228
Smith's Isaiah, . . . 146, 194
Spurgeon's Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, ... 92
Stalker's Life of Jesus Christ, . 263
Stark's Life's Phases, . . . 68
Stirling's Gifford Lectures, . 47, 131
Stubbs' For Christ and City, . 90
Studia Biblica, . 26, 134, 234, 267
Stuart's City Pulpit, Vol. iv., . 90
Swete's Old Testament in Greek, 193, 217
Thomson's Books which Influenced our Lord, ... 220
Thornton's Opposites, . . 130
Two Kinds of Truth, . . . 132
Unsworth's Aggressive Christianity, ... 155
Urquhart's Jehovistic Theories, . 215
,, What are we to Believe? 215
Vaughan's Hebrews, . . . 18
,, Stones from the Quarry, 91
Vincent's Covenant of Peace, . 92
,, Word Studies in the New Testament, . . . 228
Wace's Some Central Points of our Lord's Ministry, . . 89
Watkins' Bampton Lectures, 25, 219
Watkinson's Lessons of Prosperity, ... 89
Watkinson's Noonday Addresses, 89
Watson's First Epistle of St. John, ... 258
Watson's Gospels of Yesterday, . 132
Watts' New Apologetic, . 96, 114
Westcott's Epistles of St. John, . 231
Whitelaw's St. John's Gospel, . 229
Whiton's New Points to Old Texts, ... 87
Williams' Æsthetic Worship, . 141
Wilson's In Scripture Lands, . 215
Wood's Ancient Ephesus, . . 113
Wright's Composition of the Four Gospels, ... 26

TEXTS.

PAGE

Gen. i.–xi. 102
i. 1–ii. 4, . . . 29, 149
i. 2, . . 99, 115, 117
i. 2, 3. 86
i. 26, ... 138
ii. 4–iii. . . . 269
ii. 8–14, ... 272
ii. 9, ... 164
ii. 10, ... 146
ii. 16, 17, ... 118
iii. 7, ... 270
iii. 9, ... 140
iii. 15, ... 121
iv. 7, 8, ... 181
vi. 9, ... 180
x. 11, ... 143
xviii. 19, ... 220
xxxv. 11, ... 277
xxxvi. 31, ... 277
Exod. xiii. 17, . . . 23

	PAGE
Exod. xiv. 4,	23
Lev. xxiii. 11–16,	145, 209, 278
Deut. xvii. 14–19,	209
xxviii. 36,	278
xxxii. 46,	220
xxxiii. 5,	278
Josh. x. 12–14,	169, 273
1 Kings xiii. 31,	220
xxii. 21,	115
2 Kings xx. 1,	220
Job vii. 15,	85
Psalms xi. 7,	252
xvi. 10,	52, 100
xvi. 10, 11,	251
xvii. 15,	250
xxi. 5,	252
xxix. 6,	80, 139
xxxvi. 10,	252
xli. 13,	252
xlv. 3,	252
xlix. 15, 16,	248
lxi. 7,	252
lxiii. 9, 10,	252
lxxii. 5,	252
lxxiii. 24–28,	251
lxxxiv.	137
cx.	172
cx. 4,	171
cxix. 151,	3
Prov. xx. 4, 5,	42
Isa. viii. 14,	243
xxv. 7, 8,	226
xxvi. 19,	148
lxv. 17–25,	227
lxvi. 24,	227, 248

	PAGE
Jer. xviii. 1–17,	274
Dan. xii. 2,	248
Matt. iii. 2,	84
iii. 11,	46
v. 22,	42
vi. 11,	184, 242, 254
viii. 28,	74, 101
xi. 16–19,	37
xi. 28–30,	110
xii. 43–45,	80
xvi. 18,	243
xvi. 26,	65
xviii. 10,	23
xx. 1–16,	261, 268
Mark iii. 17,	134
v. 1,	74, 101
xii. 35–37,	172
xiv. 14, 15,	81
xv. 35,	134
Luke v. 37, 38,	109
vii. 31–35,	37
vii. 44–46,	38
viii. 26–36,	50, 73, 101
x. 19	23
xi. 3,	184, 242, 254
xiii. 32,	38
xv. 29,	109
xviii. 5,	109
xx. 9–19,	21
xxii. 7–20,	21
xxii. 11, 12,	81
xxii. 24–37,	22
xxii. 39–53,	22
xxii. 54–71,	40
xxiii. 1–12,	40

	PAGE
Luke xxiii. 13–25,	41
xxiii. 33–47,	41
xxiii. 39,	71
xxiv. 1–12,	66
xxiv. 13–27,	67
xxiv. 28–43,	67
xxiv. 44–53,	68
John vii. 39,	46
xi. 47–53,	50
xvi. 7,	46
Acts ii. 25–31,	53
ii. 27,	52, 100
Rom. i. 17,	219
iii. 25, 26,	219
viii. 6,	27
ix. 20, 21,	274
xii. 1,	3
1 Cor. iii. 16, 17,	77
v. 7,	3
vi. 19, 20,	77, 78
vii. 14,	221
x. 9,	43
x. 13,	279
x. 31,	12
xi. 23–26,	33
xii. 4–6,	59
xii. 31,	78
xiii. 11,	104
xiii. 12,	135, 161
xiii. 13,	158
xiv. 20,	259
xv. 20–22,	189
xv. 36,	42
xv. 58,	212
xvi. 13,	235

	PAGE
2 Cor. iii. 4,	4
Gal. ii. 16,	53
vi. 2, 5,	97
Eph. i. 3,	140
i. 20,	140
ii. 2,	84
ii. 6,	140
ii. 8,	4
ii. 14,	93, 106
iii. 10,	140
iii. 15,	93
iii. 18,	164
v. 19,	165, 180
vi. 12,	140, 181
vi. 14,	117
Phil. ii. 3,	97
ii. 17,	3
iv. 5,	2
iv. 18,	3
1 Tim. iv. 2,	243
2 Tim. iii. 15–17,	54
Heb. ii. 9,	18
iv. 16,	18
vi. 28,	18
viii. 4,	276
ix. 4,	18
1 Pet. iii. 19,	171
1 John ii. 6, 7,	45
ii. 8,	163
ii. 9–11,	246
ii. 28,	4
iii. 19,	10
iv. 17,	4
v. 7,	1
Rev. xiii. 18,	11

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

With this issue we begin our second volume. Let us greet with hearty thanks the able editors who have welcomed us so generously, and the readers who have approved that welcome. Our circle of friends is now considerable, and it is enlarging month by month: we shall do our endeavour in the months that are before us to make the friendship true and lasting.

For the binding of the first volume the publishers have prepared a cloth case which strikes us as so much better than anything likely to be got otherwise for the money, that we think it right to recommend it here. It is dark green, with clean cut titles, and shield monogram on the back.

There is at present a wide and earnest desire for the means of systematic and scientific biblical study. We have had abundant evidence of it sent us in the past year. The Expository Times Guild was entered upon in consequence. But we knew from the first that we should have to develop that scheme; and now, in an announcement which will be found on another page, we advance a step further. Let every one who is interested in the subject of Bible study send us a post-card; name the book you wish studied; recommend some manual on it if you can; and, especially, name some scholar or scholars whom you judge capable of writing on it.

A copy has been sent us of the *Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung* of August 2. It contains a translation of the article on Delitzsch, contributed to The Expository Times by the Rev. G. Elmslie Troup, M.A., which appeared in our issue for May. The translation is entitled "Eine englische Stimme über Frz. Delitzsch's theologisches Wirken."

Reviewing Lichtenberger's *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, in a recent number of the *Churchman*, Dr. Plummer of Durham recalls the famous sermon of Dr. Tatham, Rector of Lincoln, preached before the University of Oxford in defence of the spurious passage about the heavenly witnesses in 1 John v. 7. The discourse lasted two hours and a half, and was fatal to at least one Head of House, who never recovered the ill effects of the long sitting. It was in the course of this unfortunate sermon that Dr. Tatham, standing in a University pulpit, enthusiastically wished "all Jarman critics at the bottom of the Jarman Ocean." That is ninety years ago; but there are still, says Dr. Plummer, "a considerable number of people to whom 'German criticism' is a sound which inspires them with suspicion, if not with horror; and there are very many more, who, without sharing these prejudices, are, nevertheless, altogether at sea as to what has been done by German scholars in the sphere of theology during the present century, and to whom nine out of ten leading names are names and nothing more, conveying no meaning as to the tendencies, sympathies, or achievements of the persons who bore them."

Dr. Plummer says that we can well afford to give up both our prejudice and our ignorance, for

the progress of theological learning in England during the last five-and-thirty years has a great deal more than equalled the progress made in Germany during the same period. And now he believes that we can hold our own with the best of them, for "it is true that England at the beginning of this period had much more to learn than Germany; but it is also true that she had much less to unlearn."

In Sedgwick's *Life and Letters,* just issued by the Clarendon Press, one of the best books of the month, there is an amusing illustration of this comparison made by Dr. Plummer between English and German theologians. It is a geologist's book; for Adam Sedgwick, though by nature a theologian, was turned by circumstance into a geologist, and made his fame thereby. The circumstance was the singular one of his appointment to the Woodwardian Professorship of Geology at Cambridge, when he knew nothing about the subject. His own explanation of it is this: "I had but one rival, Gorham of Queen's, and he had not the slightest chance against me, for I knew absolutely nothing of geology, whereas he knew a great deal—*but it was all wrong.*" He did not disgrace the appointment. "Hitherto," he is reported to have said, "I have never turned a stone; henceforth I will leave no stone unturned."

The great topic since our last, in daily, weekly, and monthly, has been John Henry Cardinal Newman. Many strange things have been said, some unexpected disclosures made, and altogether the subject deserves the interest it has created. But it is not over yet. We shall wait a month, and then see what the gain has been. On the whole, *Nil nisi bonum* has prevailed; so that Adam Sedgwick's comment on the secession, though it probably expressed the average Englishman's opinion at the time, appearing just at this time has something incongruous about it. What Darwin remarked as to his attitude towards natural selection—"Poor dear old Sedgwick seems rabid on the question"—may almost be said of his attitude to Newman's secession also. His comment was: "Shame on them that they did not do so long since! Their attempt to remain in the Church of England while they held opinions such as they have published only proves that fanaticism and vulgar honesty can seldom shake hands and live together. I pity their delusion, I despise their sophistry, and I hate their dishonesty."

Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority* is declared to be a success commercially. Not such a success as it would have been had not the phenomenal run of *Lux Mundi* preceded it. But a greater success than it deserves to be. For, as Dr. Sanday remarked in his review of the book in our last issue, as far as positive results are concerned, there is no comparison between it and the truly great books which went before it, *Types of Ethical Theory* and *A Study of Religion.* Surely something of this success is due to the shoreless ignorance of recent German theology which Dr. Plummer deplores. No one wondered that *Robert Elsmere* was a success, notwithstanding the weakness of its New Testament criticism. But here is a new *Robert Elsmere,* with the same confidence, and nearly as much romance, which, however, is nothing if it is not scientific criticism, and on that supposition is passing into an extensive circulation. But it offers one advantage; it challenges reply, and will receive it. In a recent number of the *Evangelical Magazine,* Professor Kennedy made out an effective contrast between the position of this new Unitarianism and the old Unitarianism of Dr. Channing. Dr. R. W. Dale, in the *Contemporary Review* for September, passes its critical processes through a searching examination. And we hope we shall soon be able to offer another criticism ourselves from the pen of an accomplished Scotch scholar.

The Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review of August 30, contains a paper by the Rev. R. W. Harden, B.A., on the words, "The Lord is at hand" (ὁ Κύριος ἐγγύς)—Phil. iv. 5. The interpretation of these words, almost universally adopted, is that they refer to the nearness of Christ's Second Coming. Mr. Harden holds that they express the nearness of our Lord now. They are, in fact, St. Paul's translation of "I am with you alway." We have not read an exposition which was conducted in a better spirit, or with a more truly scientific method. This is how the New Testament should be studied; such a method, patiently and reverently pursued, will make a man

a New Testament scholar indeed. We believe that, against almost all the expositors, Mr. Harden has made his point; but that is a small matter in comparison with the example he has given us how to prove all things in New Testament interpretation and hold fast that which is good.

Mr. Harden is not absolutely alone in his interpretation. After writing the note, a sudden recollection made us turn to Principal Moule's little book, *Thoughts on the Spiritual Life* (London: Seeley, 1s.), and there it is: "Let your moderation be known unto all men: the Lord is at hand." After speaking of the blessing of being a "moderate" in this sense, he says: "And would we read something, in this same verse, of its heavenly *secret?* It lies before us: 'the Lord is near.' He is near, not here in the sense of coming soon, but in that of standing by; in the sense of His presence, and the 'secret' of it, around His servant. The very words used here by St. Paul occur in this connection in the Septuagint (Greek) translation of the Old Testament, a translation old even in St. Paul's time: 'Thou art near (ἐγγύς), O Lord'—Ps. cxix. 151. The thought is of the calm and overshadowing of His recollected and realized presence; that divine atmosphere in which bitter things, and things narrow with the contractions and distortions of self, must die, and in which all that is sweet and loving lives."

The August issue of the *Homiletic Review* contains an exposition by Dr. Howard Crosby, under the title of "Christ our Passover." He maintains that the word "sacrifice," whether as verb or substantive, always expresses the idea of punishment and destruction, and never the idea of a gift. The verb (θύω) is used of the Passover Lamb three times in the New Testament, Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 7. In all other places it is used in the general sense of "sacrifice," or it simply means "to kill," as in Matt. xxii. 4, "My oxen and my fatlings are killed (τεθυμένα)." The substantive (θυσία) occurs twenty-nine times, and is always rendered "sacrifice." In Heb. viii. 3, and elsewhere, it is directly distinguished from "gifts." The idea of "sacrifice" being a gift to God, the expression of the offerer's gratitude is therefore not in the word, but an import from pagan thought. Of course Dr. Crosby remembers the *bloodless* offering, which was the gift of a worshipper reconciled by the bloody sacrifice, and who thus as a child could offer a gift to his father.

If "killing" rather than "presenting" is the essential element in the word "sacrifice," there are some passages which are popularly misunderstood. One of these is Rom. xii. 1, "That ye present your bodies a living sacrifice." The idea is not that we present our goodness to God in self-consecration, but that our *sins* ("the body of this death"—Rom. vii. 24) are to be presented for destruction. So "the sacrifice and service of faith" on the part of the Philippians, in which Paul would have a part by being poured out as a libation on it (Phil. ii 17), was their faith bringing their sins to be destroyed through the great sacrifice of Christ. And, again, the things sent by these Philippians to Paul through Epaphroditus were "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil. iv. 18), not because they were a gift to God, but because they were an instance of their condemnation of sin and assertion of love, the foundation of which was the great sacrifice of Christ.

We gladly mention a little book by Dr. Howard Crosby, which has just appeared (*The Seven Churches of Asia; or, Worldliness in the Church.* By Howard Crosby. London: Funk & Wagnalls, 3s.) It is not an exposition pure and simple, and we do not always approve of its interpretations, (notably in regard to the "hidden manna" and the "white stone"), but it is the work of a tried expositor, and its subject is one which demands careful expository work more than most. Dr. Crosby has left something for other reapers; but he has brought home many ripe sheaves.

The first number of the new Literary and Theological Quarterly, under Dr. Salmond's editorship, is to be very strong. It will contain contributions by Principal Fairbairn, Principal Rainy, Professor Driver, Dr. Alfred Plummer, Dr. Hutchison Stirling, Professor A. B. Davidson, Professor Marcus Dods, Professor Candlish, Dr. Stalker, Rev. G. A. Smith, and several others whose names are held in high repute.

The mention of Dr. Hutchison Stirling's name recalls the fact that when he was appointed to the Gifford Lectureship by the University of Edinburgh, men were heard asking, Who is Dr. Hutchison Stirling? They were not specialists in philosophy who put the question; but to hear it put by persons who had any literary knowledge at all was startling. Dr. M'Cosh of Princeton has a paper in the third number of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* on "Kant and his Recent Commentators," and when he reaches Dr. Hutchison Stirling's "Introduction," he says: "Dr. Stirling is a stalwart and strong-boned (metaphysically speaking) Scotchman. His style reads as if it were modelled on that of Thomas Carlyle; yet I am not sure that he copies his Scoto-German countryman. The resemblance may arise from both in their youth speaking lowland Scotch, which has more affinities with German than the English tongue has, and from their being led by their admiration of German thinking to adopt the powerful style of Deutschland. I have often wondered how it is that Dr. Stirling has not been called to some chair of Philosophy in Scotland, England, or America. I have an idea that this neglect has been caused by a fear on the part of academic authorities of his leading his pupils into the woods and wilds of Hegelianism. I am glad to find that he has been called to deliver lectures on Natural Religion on the Foundation of a lately deceased Professor in Edinburgh. It is the first recognition of his great abilities by College authorities."

There has been a long run of correspondence of unusual interest in the *Record*, under the heading of "Keswick Teaching," to which Canon Bell, Principal Moule, and Mr. Meyer, among others, have contributed. The discussion has thrown out branches in several directions, as discussions are apt to do; but the real question has been pointedly expressed by the Rev. W. Barry Cole in the issue of July 11. In "A Child of Faith in an age of Doubt," Andrew Bremner uses these words: "On my way, pondering on what I had been hearing, I was enabled to see that I had just to accept the gift of more holiness as I had accepted the gift of salvation." Mr. Cole doubts if that is sound scriptural teaching; Canon Bell doubts it also. Principal Moule, we think, accepts it as the teaching of Keswick.

In another letter, contributed to the *Record* of August 15, Mr. Cole enumerates five points as the truths, or aspects of truth, which are, he says, specially emphasized at Holiness Conventions. They are these: (1) There is a certain "sphere," "condition of soul," "attitude," or "position," which may be attained instantaneously by faith. (2) So long as this "attitude" is maintained, the tendency to sin, which exists in all, is effectually held in check. (3) Those true Christians who have not by faith attained hereunto are experimentally ignorant of the "liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." (4) In seeking this "blessing" by faith we must not expect any immediate sense of inward joy at its realization, but must hold on to the belief that it is ours, whatever our feelings may be; and eventually, it may be very soon, or it may be after long waiting, the soul will be consciously filled with the Holy Ghost and with power. (5) A definite act of personal consecration—provided there be no reserve, and we be entirely emptied of self—is sure to be followed in due course by this special "blessing."

In the *Christian*, also, the teaching at the Keswick Convention has been under discussion, though in much smaller dimensions. Here, however, in the issue of August 22 may be found one of the most fruitful letters of the whole. An anonymous correspondent having expressed his belief that the Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe was accustomed to draw a distinction between the three words "faith," "trust," and "confidence," Mr. Webb-Peploe promptly replies that he does so, the distinction being scriptural. "Three words are used in the apostolic writings, viz. *pistis*, *pepoithēsis*, and *parrhēsia*, (πίστις, πεποίθησις, παρρησία), which, as every scholar knows, have totally different meanings; and these words are rendered as I gave them, in, for example, Eph. ii. 8 (*pistis*, "faith"), 2 Cor. iii. 4 (*pepoithēsis*, "trust"), and 1 John ii. 28, and iv. 17 (*parrhēsia*, "confidence" and "boldness"). The distinction is most important, and deserves fuller exposition, which we hope to offer shortly.

The *Contemporary Review* for September has an enthusiastic article by Professor Sayce on Mr. Flinders Petrie's recent excavations in Palestine, to which we referred last month. He believes that Palestine exploration has only just begun. "The explorer," he says, "who will devote himself to the labour, as Sir A. H. Layard devoted himself to Nineveh, and Dr. Schliemann to Troy, will obtain results as marvellous and far-reaching as those obtained by Layard and Schliemann. The former story of Palestine has not been obliterated from its soil, as has often been imagined; on the contrary, it is indelibly impressed on the stone and clay which that soil still holds in its bosom. We have dug up Homer and Herodotus; we shall yet dig up the Bible."

Ritschl — Lightfoot — Hatch.

By the Rev. Principal Rainy, D.D.

The three names which head this paper are connected together by the fact that death took them all from us within a few months. A fourth might have been added,—that of Delitzsch,—as eminent and as attractive as any of the others. But to say a fitting word of the other three is a task more than sufficient for the limits I must observe.

I begin with the most remote, and therefore with Ritschl. Ritschl was best known as an independent thinker in dogmatic theology. As such he made a deep mark, and rallied to himself a school of resolute disciples. His teaching raised great issues; for in addition to technical dogmatics, it involved a specific conception of the idea of the Christian life, and of the forces on which that depends. It was connected also with views of the history of theology, and of the relation of Reformation theology to his own dogmatic, which created lively debate. But he was not confined exclusively even to this wide field. When we go back a little in the history of his life, we find him active in investigations belonging to a somewhat different region.

No doubt the dogmatic questions were in his view from the first. In the preface to the first volume of his large book on the Justification and Atonement, which was published in 1870, Ritschl spoke as follows: "Almost thirty years have passed since, in the third semester of my academical studies, I became clear upon this, that with a view to my theological culture I needed, above all else, to come to an understanding of the doctrine of the atonement. I endeavoured at the time to obtain special guidance towards this goal; I did not find it in the form I needed; and now, after connected investigation of the later German theology, I perceive that I had no ground to expect at that time from any one fruitful guidance towards the solution of the problem. Other objects meanwhile forced themselves upon me as matter of scientific effort. After I had brought these to a close, as far as I was concerned in them, I took up again independently the question of my younger days."

The objects which forced themselves upon him were the questions connected with the earliest history of the Church. Those were the days in which the great debate created by the Tübingen school was in full progress. Ritschl became involved in it, because he felt the necessity of coming to a conclusion regarding questions so nearly touching the life of Christianity. At first the speculations of Baur and his followers acquired a great ascendency over him, and he published in 1850 a volume, *Die Alt Katholische Kirche*, which bore very plainly the marks of this state of mind. The positions of the Tübingen men were contested in various details, but no clear or thorough-going principle as to the way of conceiving or construing the history was attained or expounded. The book embodied, therefore, rather the Tübingen position, with qualifications, than the defence of any distinct alternative. Further reflection and study led him to adopt new points of view. In 1857 (after seven years) a second edition appeared. The general arrangement was not much altered. But the author could declare that the book, from the foundation upwards, had become a new book. This second edition of the *Alt Katholische Kirche* I have always regarded as a very instructive and useful work. Ritschl's native aptitude for dogmatics is skilfully applied to the early movements of theological opinion in the Church. The book does better service than any I know in the way of making plain the historical mistakes into which Baur fell in his conception of the Church parties of the apostolic and post-apostolic time. It is still an excellent work to read for the purpose of acquiring insight into the earliest Church history, and the relations of the post-apostolic to the apostolic age. I think it is possible to trace to its influence important elements in Lightfoot's historical views; and I could hardly pay any book a higher compliment.

But this, after all, was only an episode. In the year in which the second edition just referred to was published, 1857, Ritschl returned to the sub-

ject of his early meditations; and a number of important review articles marked the progress of his thought. These led up to Ritschl's main contribution to the theology of his time, viz. his work on the doctrine of Justification and Atonement, in its three divisions, which set forth the historical, the biblical, and the dogmatic or systematic aspects of the subject; the first appearing in 1870, and the other two in 1874. The first of these divisions, the historical, very soon became extensively known in this country by the translation of Mr. Black and Professor Smith, both of whom had studied under Ritschl at Göttingen. The work, as a whole, took an indisputable place as one of the most forcible manifestations of contemporary thought on the theology of redemption. In Germany the weight of it, reinforced by subsequent expositions from the author and his disciples, has been felt ever since. A lively and confident school have formed themselves on Ritschl's principles; and by drawing attacks upon themselves from very diverse quarters of the theological compass, they have recently proved their readiness to meet all comers.

To begin at the circumference, Ritschl's style is not exactly easy reading. Possibly this goes some way to account for a kind of respectful vagueness in regard to Ritschl's teaching, which one notices occasionally in theological minds. It takes a good deal of vigilance and scrutiny to keep perfect touch with him, and to feel sure that you take his meaning thoroughly. It need not be doubted that this meaning is, in itself, really clear and consecutive. And yet as the sentences pass, a slight haze arises between you and him, which it requires a conscious effort to dissipate. This is quite as much felt in the translation as in the original; and fully as much in the historical criticisms as in those portions which are occupied with original discussion. It may be something in the structure of his thought, or something in the manner of expressing it. It does not seem to be quite sharply and legibly minted. The difficulty is not unmanageable, but one always feels it.

The historical review which occupies the first volume, as many of you know, is by itself a very considerable performance, not merely in point of bulk, but as regards the amount of mental work it represents. Every student of doctrine history must reckon with it; and every one who does so will own that it ranks among the books which compel the reader to think. Its main defect as a history for students is that it is not sufficiently objective. It does not take pains enough to depict each scheme from its own point of view. The writer is occupied throughout with the criticisms he has to apply to the successive forms of doctrine. These criticisims are mainly animated by the purpose of clearing the way to his own theory. Hence he is chiefly intent, first, on bringing out those aspects or those points of a given theory to which his criticisms are to apply, and then in developing the criticism itself. In one point of view he was entitled to do this. He might consider himself as writing for a public able to bring to the perusal of the book enough of knowledge to supply any needed cross lights. All I say is, that while Ritschl's criticisms are always worth weighing, you must take it that his sketches, though grounded on very wide and intelligent reading, often lack something in shading and proportion. I would not say that his treatment even of Anselm or of Grotius (not to speak of thinkers of a lower rank) is exempt from this remark.

More important for consideration is the construction of the doctrine of our redemption which Ritschl presents on his own behalf. There are good reasons why I should here abstain from any pretence of a full discussion or a complete estimate. The mode of discussion which Ritschl adopts, and which constitutes from a certain point of view, one excellence of his work, causes it to become virtually rather a system of Theology than a determination of one doctrinal point. More than this, his treatment may be said to rest at bottom on a special philosophy of religion and on a special conception of the true method in theology; and his principles on both heads, while virtually embodied in the book before us, have only gradually and subsequently been explained fully and in their connection; hence they have created active discussion within the last two or three years. I decline to enter on this wide field, and will confine myself to a line of remark better suited to a magazine article.

Two features of Ritschl's treatment may be mentioned as contributing to the interest and profit of students. One is the thorough independence, and in general the ability, with which he sifts every notion that presents itself. He calls upon each theological alternative, or hypothesis, to answer for its life, at the bar of a relentless dialectic; and no weak grounds—especially no internal inconsistencies—seem to escape his detection. This has great value for a student who is properly prepared, and is able to keep his own feet under him while the process goes on. But I will hazard this remark, viz. that this keen and searching dialectic is not by any means in all cases so solid as at first sight it seems. There are cases, indeed, in which it becomes finical and unworthy, for this reason. It belongs to the nature of theology that in some instances our determinations must content themselves to be approximate. They denote the eternal and infinite objects in a manner which is not false, but yet is not adequate; which conveys a real knowledge, but does not supply sharp mathematical outlines. In all such cases it is possible to do great work in the way of criticism, by demanding a precision and a consistency which

the case does not admit of. We ought not to complain of being reminded that our thought, approaching great and divine objects on this side and that, is imperfect. But we may complain when the critic forgets the limitations which render perfection impossible. For that implies insensibility, for the time, to the conditions on which the grandeur of the theme depends. I will not say that Ritschl is insensible to this necessity in the conduct of his own thinking; but I think he sometimes disregards it in his criticism of the thinking he chooses to discard.

Another stimulating feature of Ritschl's treatment, is the manner in which he insists on connecting the doctrine of the atonement with the experience of the religious life. He insists on its being made clear how the atonement, according to any view of it under discussion, is, actually and worthily, the soul's way to God. And that leads him to weigh the question of this reconciliation in relation to a wide circle of theological positions. He proposes to set the question in the light of every one of the theologoumena which any way bear upon redemption, and to demand in connection with each a connection of thought in virtue of which all shall concur, for the understanding and the heart, in one great religious reconciliation. As he brings the discussion of justification and atonement into relation with the various forms of need by sin—with the various forms of Divine action and relation—with the experiences of trust, assurance, freedom—with the nature of the Divine Being and the ends of His government—with the person of Christ, the states (of Humiliation and Exaltation), and the three offices; as he applies himself to bring out the various respects in which forgiveness is necessary—the various lines along which the action and passion of Christ can influence the problem—and finally, the bearing of atonement in various aspects of the Christian character and attainment—it is impossible not to feel how suggestive this is; and a stimulus is applied to one's thinking on a multitude of topics. To realize this fully—and I may add, to be in a position to judge it safely—one ought to be beforehand well read on all these topics in the theology of the older schools. Such reading is all implied, for it is before the author's mind, and he supposes it to be before his own readers.

But we have to remember that on the principles of a certain philosophy of religion, and along the lines of a certain method of dogmatic, Ritschl is, to a large extent, constructing a theological connection which dictates his result.

In saying a word or two about that result, I wish, first of all, to acknowledge Ritschl's religious interest in his theme. He sets his face steadily towards a blessed future for men, reconciled to God, a future achieved in connection with the actual history of Christ. And there are important sections of Christian experience for which he cherishes manifest sympathy and appreciation.

But in his system, a doubt, if not more than a doubt, hangs over the question of our Lord's Divinity. His discussion of it is very peculiar, and rather tends to hold the question in suspense, and to baffle the reader who wishes to bring it to an ay or no. But I rather agree with one who has read Ritschl closely, and who says, "Ritschl is resolutely ambiguous in his doctrine of Christ's person. So far as we can break down his guard, we find that in spite of the use of the Divine name, as applied to Christ, the school of Ritschl really regard Christ as a uniquely endowed man, and no more" (Mackintosh, *Essays*, p. 139). Let me add that very emphatically the wholly exceptional and unique character of Christ *is* acknowledged.

As to the atonement, it is generally known that Ritschl conceives it in connection with the special importance attached by him to the doctrine of the kingdom of God. There is no difficulty on God's part in forgiving sin, no justice stands in His way; but forgiveness ought to take place in a manner that harmonizes with God's procedure towards the great and final end He has in view. Let me, in a sentence or two, sketch the theory which hence arises.

The loving God has in view for mankind a destiny denoted by the "kingdom of God"—that is, a society in which love to God and one another are triumphantly supreme, so that men are to be set free from all lower forces and necessities, and blessedness in goodness shall prevail. Men, meanwhile, are involved in sin; and the sense of this works by creating apprehension towards God, distrust and alienation, cutting off the trust in God and the fellowship with Him which would operate as the remedial forces. Christ appears, living a life of unbroken love to God and man, enjoying and maintaining the fellowship with God of which human nature is capable. It becomes evident to Him that he has it for His calling to found the kingdom of God referred to. In accepting that calling, He is in perfect unity with God's own end; and He prosecutes it in that perfect love to man, which is God's own will. To follow this out, gathering men into the kingdom, is at once His chosen calling, and the natural unfolding of His own religious life. On His doing so the actual gathering of men into the kingdom, and their upbuilding in it, depends. For God's gracious purpose regarding His kingdom only becomes known and sure to us men, as we see Christ's face steadily set towards it as the very end of His being. And it is on the type of Christ's religion hat our religion is to take shape and inspiration, trusting in God, rising above the world, loving one another. The way of it is this then, that to the members of the community of Christ, forgiveness

of sin is assured, and so fellowship with God is opened to them. The covenant of forgiveness is connected with acceding to the community of Christ. In that community God is to deal with us, and is to train us, on the footing of the assured forgiveness of sins. Now, I have said that to found this kingdom became the calling, the life, the religion of Christ, as it is the final aim of God Himself. But His calling in this respect imposed on Him great trouble in life, and finally, death—which it was His part to take, and which He did take with perfect submission, consent, and love. Had He failed in doing so, the founding of the kingdom would have failed. The community of Christ, with its assured forgiveness of sins, would not have existed. His faithfulness in life and death founded the kingdom. This is the relation of Christ's action and passion to the forgiveness of sins.

This is a bald statement, because I wished to make it a short one. But it gives the essential position. Is it too much to say that this view elaborately—laboriously—evades the main thing?

There may be in the atonement—I deeply believe there is—what outgoes all our analogies and all our thoughts. But surely if we take our conception of the benefit we have by Christ from inspired teaching, we must own this element in it,—that whereas it becomes God, in dealing with those that have sinned, to manifest His dread displeasure with all sin, and yet He, in His great love, would deliver us and set us among the children; therefore Christ coming to bless us bore the strain of that great problem which we had created, bore it with unspeakable love and sorrow, and ended it for us in His sacrifice. I have never been able to see why that apparent teaching of the Scripture should not be thankfully accepted. I am sure that the sense of it is one of the strong cords that bind believers to their Lord. And I never have been able to see how, on other theories, three biblical elements of a believer's experience can reach their biblical fulness and assuredness. These are:—

1. The believer's sense of obligation to Christ, who has saved us by bearing our burden, and dying for our sins.
2. The believer's attitude towards God, as set upon the key of an immortal repentance, and carrying with it the acceptance of the punishment of our iniquities.
3. The believer's conflict with sin, as animated by the consciousness, that his Lord has redeemed him from it.

A large book more lately appeared from Ritschl's pen—a history of Pietism. It is a natural appendix to his treatise on the Atonement, in this way. The Pietists made earnest work with the doctrine of conversion, as bringing men to forgiveness as well as other blessings. On the contrary, in Ritschl's theology the community of Christ to which forgiveness is attached is the visible Church. Therefore every one in the visible Church ought at once, and without more ado, to assume the certainty of forgiveness as the basis of his dealings with God. This may seem to be an extravagant and eccentric position. At the same time, it leads into a great deal of discussion of interesting questions connected with the practical administration of Christianity. These Ritschl connects with the history of Pietism, as an important form of religious movement and manifestation, on behalf of which high claims were made, and *to* which various religious currents of the present day bear more or less affinity. But I must say no more of it.

We may remember Ritschl as one whose thinking surely proved inadequate as regards some great theological interests. But we must also remember the standing admonition he has left us as to the scale of diligence and comprehensiveness of view, as well as the everlasting activity of mind, which the theologian ought to bring to his work. A resolute effort to master and criticise the whole course of previous discussion; a reckoning with the biblical materials, under the conditions of modern exegesis; a comprehensive adjustment of the various provinces of dogmatic bearing on his central problem, were reckoned by Ritschl to be the obligations connected with undertaking to discuss the subject at all. Nor was this all. He owned the obligation to discuss thoroughly the bearing of the whole on practical life and fellowship with God. And he laid the foundation of all his processes in earnest thought about the philosophy, and therefore the essential nature, of religion—and about the proper method of theology. We are not called upon to exaggerate the measure of his success. Indeed, we may be of opinion that fundamental faults of method misled his enterprise. But we may easily grant that so vigorous a mind could not apply itself so diligently and so long without doing service towards the disentangling and arranging of human thought on the questions he treated, and raising into view, topics and aspects of things too much overlooked before. And at all events, few of us can afford to lose the admonition afforded by the conception he embodied in his work, of the range of study and the scale of application which the theologian may bring to the tasks entrusted to him.

We come to another region, and we come to a different man, when we turn to the late Bishop of Durham. The speculative adventurousness, the serious reliance on philosophic positions and conclusions, the lively interest in dogmatic and systematic questions of theology, cease to be conspicuous here; and the gifts which peculiarly qualify for shining in those departments, if they were present, were not remarkably exercised. But

extraordinary industry and learning in the field of ecclesiastical history and criticism were combined here with a magnificent sanity of mind in using his acquirements, and with a most enviable balance of candour and firmness in admitting the claims of genuine proof, and resisting what pretended only to that character. Few men are so equally independent of learned fashions, conservative and radical, as the late bishop was, and yet so free from trace of mere individual self-assertion and eccentricity. All this he united with very unostentatious but very deep and real Christian character, and with a steadfast witness to the main things in Christian religion.

It will be a thousand pities if the mental character and the literary services of Dr. Lightfoot, which were certainly not sensational, should on that account fail to leave their impression on the theological mind, and to stamp their lesson deeply. We are passing through a period in which such lessons are needed. If we are to come creditably and safely through the currents of our time, we shall need men who combine with fearless learning and candour, a similar independence of the literary and critical fashions, that assume to dictate the acceptance of principles and the making of concessions, the grounds for which have not been established. No one ever ventured to accuse Dr. Lightfoot of obscurantism, of shutting his eyes, of preferring half knowledge to whole. Yet he was able during his whole learned life to occupy a position altogether helpful to the believing Church, defensive of positive beliefs and of the great Christian interests.

Apart from what has now been referred to, the qualities of this scholar are well worth commemorating.

Of the thoroughness of his scholarship no one, perhaps, can form an adequate impression, who has not closely followed his way of dealing with some of the texts he edited. His chosen field was the first two centuries. But his scholarship embraced not merely an extraordinary mastery of all that could be known of facts and writings of that period, but a mastery also of everything that from all quarters could be put in play to afford illustration and explanation. From point to point of the author in hand, the sense of resource grew upon you as one question after another was taken up, as the thin subtle lines of connection—lexical, grammatical, literary, historical, antiquarian, philosophical—multiplied and wove themselves between his text on the one hand, and the life and thought of the old world on the other; and as the dry, barren, unproductive, and unsuggestive sentences grew significant, interesting, and fruitful under his hand.

But more remarkable still was the justness of his view. It was not merely that he saw everything, but that he discerned so well the true bearings of what he saw. That is the mark of an essentially thorough and an essentially fair mind, able to place itself frankly and sympathetically in relation with the actual thought and speech of the bygone time. For such a mind also every new acquisition — every item of scholarship has a tenfold value; it comes easily and naturally, because really and veraciously, into relation with what has been already acquired; and so, what light it has to yield is utilized at once. Hence the completeness and masterfulness with which Dr. Lightfoot could rectify confusions, and furnish the point of view from which regions of learning were to be understood. Some of the most striking examples, perhaps, are furnished by the series of papers in the *Contemporary Review* on the book called *Supernatural Religion*. Those are now accessible in a collected form. They ought to be in the hands of students as a model of the manner in which a strong and clear man comes into an occasional debate, and turns it into an occasion of durable instruction. The author of *Supernatural Religion* had read enormously. He knew a great number of things in that way. They all catalogued themselves in his mind, in relation to their fitness to subvert *Supernatural Religion*. They were, like masses of projectiles, stored up in heaps, ready to be shot out upon faith. But though he knew a great deal in that way, he had little of the knowledge of a man who has actually lived in a country, and knows the people and the houses and the roads. But Dr. Lightfoot had. If I am to produce an instance out of many, I would refer you to his discussion of the principles on which the references of Eusebius to books of Scripture, and to previous notices of such books, are to be understood and used. Those articles abound in lessons, the value of which consists not merely in the results, but in the insight they afford into the true method of sound and fruitful learning.

Of the candour which characterized his studies and his thinking, a very well-known instance is furnished by the position he took up on the subject of the early history of the episcopate. It is not merely that he made what, from the point of view of his Church, might be reckoned a concession, but that he came out so frankly with all he thought about it, set forth his grounds without hesitation or *arrière pensée*, and made it perfectly clear why he went so far and where he stopped. He did it like a fair man and also like a strong man.

It has been said of him truly, that his width and thoroughness of attainment depended much on this, that while his natural aptitudes were great, he began early, he took the right method of building well-grounded knowledge, and he never diverged from the true path. For the sake of students, it may be suggested that probably there was a time when Dr. Lightfoot did not know how far he

might have opportunity to carry the kind of investigation which, in fact, occupied his life; but he began to assemble knowledge round one point of interest, as any of us might begin to do, kept order and relation in his studies by organizing them in relation to that point or object, and found his dominion over the earliest Christian antiquity grow, till it reached, as John Bunyan says, the bigness which we see. But the one point must have been well chosen. I will suggest to you that it probably was the Epistles of Ignatius. Those Epistles with their curious history have created, perhaps, more discussion than they are worth. And Dr. Lightfoot's edition of them, which is a miracle of completeness and a perfect model of investigation, I have some difficulty in regarding, after all, with perfect complacency. Has it not absorbed too much of the learned resource of a precious life? Notwithstanding, the whole cluster of questions which gather about Ignatius are beyond all question remarkable, fitted to set a man on to investigations that may fructify in other and much more important directions. Now, Dr. Lightfoot has told us that in 1885 the Ignatian question had occupied him for about thirty years; and in another place he makes this remark, "The Ignatian Epistles are an exceptionally good training ground for the student of early literature and history;"—probably therefore he had found them to be such.—"They present in typical and instructive forms the most varied problems—textual, exegetical, doctrinal, historical. One who has thoroughly grasped these problems will be placed in the possession of a master key, which will open to him vast storehouses of knowledge." One sees the moral. We will not dispute as to the value, proportionately, of Ignatius for his own sake. But we gather this lesson. If any one conceives the honourable ambition of doing something in the field of learning, ecclesiastical or theological, let him select some object of study, and organize his reading, thinking, and writing round that. It need not be of itself of the first importance. But *if it is well chosen*, it may be the point of departure for a life of enterprise constantly growing in interest and in vitality. If, providentially, the student is arrested at any point—still his work up to that point is coherent, relatively complete, and worth his pains; if he is permitted to go on, it grows continually in attractiveness as well as in width and depth.

The question whether it was well to expend so much force and time on the edition of Ignatius, suggests the other question whether it was well to expend so select a scholar as Dr. Lightfoot on the miscellaneous duties of the Bishop of Durham. One must defer much to his own judgment on that point. It was no unworthy view which led the scholar and teacher to feel the call to the cure of souls in a great diocese to be imperative. At the same time one regrets it; for it not only abridged his labours in the field of ecclesiastical learning, but it arrested completely what he designed in the exposition of the Epistles. There may be expositors who penetrate more profoundly into the theology and into the peculiar genius of the Apostle Paul. But when in regard to the various questions which gather round the Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, either as to their historical setting, or as to the fair interpretation of difficult passages, one conceives the desire to know what a mind furnished with abundant knowledge and exceptionally true and just in its working would say to such a question, the eye travels of itself to the corner of the library where Lightfoot's volumes stand.

A few words must be said of Dr. Hatch. Perhaps of the three, one is more inclined to mourn his removal than that of either of the others. And that not because of finding oneself in complete sympathy with his points of view or modes of view. Rather one seemed often to miss something. But partly his loss is mourned so emphatically for this reason, that more of his work seemed yet to lie in the future: we had, as it were, but begun to get what he could give us. Partly, however, and still more, one mourns because he was one of those few men—few indeed—who brought to his work a perfectly fresh eye. I have spoken of Dr. Lightfoot's justness of view. I do not know that I would ascribe that in the same degree to Hatch. But in a quite remarkable degree he had freshness of view. And that is a quality of extraordinary value. For when such a man brings up his new perception of an old problem, it is easy for us all to find plenty of solid, prosaic, steady-going sense with which to hem it in, and indeed drown it, if it deserves that fate. But how few of us all could provide the element *he* contributes! Let it be observed that I am speaking of something quite different from eccentricity of view. That again is comparatively easy to be had. But Hatch was an instance of the man who, in the line of real, solid, first-hand knowledge and investigation, perceives fresh aspects of old things, and notes their significance for the studious modern world.

Who could believe that anything fresh could be said or suggested upon the question of the government of the earliest Church, and the view to be taken of bishops and presbyters. We were not agreed, but we knew so well all that could be said. It had been all debated, over and over debated, out of all proportion to the real weight of the question, or the value of any conclusions that hung upon it. The same old straw had been thrashed again and again. Since the days of Blondel's *Apologia* or Hammond's *Dissertationes*, we had gone on pelting one another with weary iteration, so that it made one mournful to have, for any purpose, to go over the well-trodden ground

again. Hatch's book came out, and—almost incredible to say—one found oneself looking at it all from a new point of view. All the old familiar scenery presented itself at a somewhat different angle and at a new perspective; one felt oneself drawn and bound to make a new reckoning with all the old authorities, and make a new estimate of results. Now it does not matter at all to my present purpose, though it should be pleaded that Dr. Hatch looked too exclusively from the side on which he thus approached the object—saw things a little too exclusively in that peculiar light. Very likely. I am myself disposed to think and say so. Only it must be observed that was in a manner his business. It was his special contribution. But let it be so. The important thing was that it was a new aspect—a new line of approach, a new connection of facts and principles, a new road by which to come down on the old positions. It was a remarkable coincidence that just then the Διδαχη fell in, to complete and confirm the impression that there was really something new.

And I repeat this was not a work of mere eccentric guess-making. It was the fruit of solid first-hand learning in a man who made fresh pathways through the forests of antiquity, and who, I repeat it once more, wherever he came applied a fresh eye.

He remained only long enough to let us see that he was able to perform similar service for us in many another region of ecclesiastical research. He would have taught us, or forced us, to open our minds to sides of things heretofore overlooked. I repeat that I do not pretend always to have been in perfect sympathy with his modes of thinking. But I respected his thoroughness, his first-hand independence; I appreciated his freshness of vision, and I mourn his loss.

Students and divines may own something animating in feeling that the actual strain and exertion of mind, goes on with reference to the great and various themes which are the objects of our science. If notable labourers are passing away, still their work admonishes us that more work remains to do, for all that has been spoken of is only a part—these various labours only so many fragments—of the great work which the Church has in hand, in so far as it is her mission to confront the inquiring and labouring human mind with just views and just impressions of the great history of redemption. Other animating influences there are, in the discoveries of fresh material which are being made, and in the feeling, impossible to resist, that we may be, must be, on the verge of more. Some day the five books of Papias, some day the book on heresies of Justin Martyr, some day Hegesippus may turn up. Anything may turn up, and set us all agoing afresh. There are also sources of a deeper interest, and reasons for a graver enthusiasm. We are passing through a time in which there is in a sense a co-operative effort to sift Christianity, its books, its doctrines, its methods, its fruits, down to the very last fibre, by the same methods and with the same severity with which any other religion would be tested. In that effort, believers, as well as unbelievers, are engaged with a tacit consent—carrying on what must be, what cannot help being, processes of dissection on objects which involve the most living and the most sacred of interests. I have not a word to say against the inevitableness, the necessity, the obligation that this process should go on, and the final advantage that many come by it; though perhaps much needs to be laid to heart as to the spirit in which we may take part in it. But it creates a very peculiar form of experience for the Church of Christ. And if it is to be happily traversed, a succession of grave and earnest thinkers and students must be looked for, who will carry down to the future the best qualities of those who have been taken away.

A Suggested Exposition of Rev. xiii. 18.

By the Rev. W. T. Lynn, B.A.

It may seem a wild idea to make another attempt to explain the six hundred three score and six of Rev. xiii. 18; but I hope I may be read before being condemned.

It seems to me, then, that Hengstenberg makes a very wise suggestion on the subject, but does not draw the right conclusion. "Here," he remarks, "we must not wander after our own imaginations. The Seer of the Apocalypse lives entirely in Holy Scripture. On this territory, therefore, is the solution of the sacred riddle to be sought." He then goes on to find in the name of Adonikam, whose "sons," or rather descendants, in Ezra ii. 13, are given as six hundred sixty and six in number. But may I call attention to that number in 1 Kings x. 14, where it represents the number of talents of gold which came to Solomon in one year. The luxury and extravagance thus brought in corrupted the heart of the king himself, who, considered the model of wisdom, gave way, led astray by wealth and its consequences, to wickedness and idolatry in his old age. May not the number in question there represent worldliness and covetousness, of which Christ our Lord taught us so especially to take heed and beware.

Additional probability is given to this by the preceding verse in Revelation (xiii. 17), where the votaries of this are described as the worshippers of the beast and of his image.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

UNDER the title of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES GUILD OF BIBLE STUDY, books of great value (such as Dorner's *Ethics*, Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*, Lichtenberger's *History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century*) have been offered to contributors of the best papers on expository and literary subjects suggested.

The Editor is encouraged to extend the scope of this Guild, and now makes the following announcement.

A book, or portion of a book, of Scripture will be chosen for study, some manual will be recommended as a guide, which will be supplemented by articles in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from scholars of recognised ability. Those who wish to engage in the systematic study of a portion of Scripture are invited to co-operate in reading this book (or part) and the articles on it. At intervals Examination Papers will be given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, of varying grades of difficulty, and books of value will be sent to those who contribute the best papers.

If you sympathize with this effort to promote systematic biblical study, kindly send a post card immediately to the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B., say which book (or portion), whether in the Old Testament or in the New, you should prefer taken up for study this session, and add the names of any scholars who have written or whom you should recommend as specially qualified to write upon the book.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 COR. X. 31.

"Whether, therefore, ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

EXPOSITION.

This verse is not an inference from what precedes, but states the conclusion of the whole matter, the principle which is to regulate our conduct in regard to the points in question and all our proceedings.—*Webster and Wilkinson.*

"*To the glory of God.*" When is a thing done for the glory of God? No deeds of ours can add to or detract from the glory of God. From all eternity He has been what He is, and to all eternity He will remain the same. When we do anything for the glory of God, we bring His glory out and make it appear to the eyes of men. We do not give Him what He has not, but cause what He has to be seen of men.—*W. H. H. Murray.*

In questions not in themselves good or evil, the believer should ask himself, not, What will be most agreeable or most advantageous to me? but, What will best promote God's glory and the salvation of my brethren? God's glory is the splendour of His perfections, particularly of His holiness and love manifested in the midst of His creatures. The question for the believer is therefore translated into this, What will best make my brethren understand the love and holiness of my heavenly Father? —*Godet.*

"*All:*" without any limit whatever. "*Magnum axioma,*" says Bengel. A Christian's collective action should be directed harmoniously towards the one end of redounding to the glory of God; for all truly Christian conduct and work is a practical glorifying of God.—*Meyer.*

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

RELIGION IN COMMON LIFE.

By the Rev. T. de Witt Talmage.

1. Let us bring the religion of Christ into our *everyday conversation.* When an earthquake in South America swallows down a whole city, people begin to talk about the uncertainty of life, and they imagine that they are engaged in religious conversation. No; we ought every day to be talking religion, if there is anything glad about it, anything beautiful about it, anything important about it. But we must *live* religion, or we cannot talk it.

2. We must bring the religion of Christ into our *everyday employments.* The Church of God and the Sabbath are only our armoury where we are to get weapons. The battlefield is on the other days of the week, and at our regular daily work. A sermon is useless unless we can take it with us behind the plough and the counter.

3. We must bring the religion of Christ into our *everyday trials.* Most of our trials, we say, are too small for such occupation. Go into a sculptor's studio and see him shaping a statue. How gentle are his strokes! You say, "Why not strike harder?" "Oh," he replies, "that would shatter the statue!" So he works on, and by and by the

features come out, and you are charmed with it. It is the little annoyances of life that, under Christ's direction, are chiselling out our spiritual character.

4. We must bring the religion of Christ into our *everyday blessings.* We hold a harvest thanksgiving; but every day should be a thanksgiving day. Why should we have to see a blind man led by a dog before we think what a blessing eyesight is?

II.

Doing Glory to God in Pursuits of the World.

By Cardinal Newman.

When persons are convinced that eternity is the only subject that ought to claim their thoughts, they are apt altogether to forget the real importance of this life. The employments of this world, though not themselves heavenly, are, after all, the way to heaven; though not the fruit, are the seed of immortality. Surely it is possible to "serve the Lord," yet not to be "slothful in business;" not over-devoted to it, yet not to retire from it.

1. A man who has had serious thoughts, and determines to live more religiously than before, if his business is one lawful in itself and pleasing to God, ought not to quit it or become indolent in it. If it is irksome, it will afford him the opportunity of self-discipline. And if he finds that he cannot countenance the over-reaching ways and sordid actions in which others indulge, and thereby he is thrown back in life, he will count it a humiliation which his sins deserve, and which may be turned into a real gain.

2. He will regard his business as a means of letting his light shine before men, and recommending to others the gospel of God by his diligence and activity in it, by his conscientious walk and utter freedom from all affectation.

3. He will take his worldly business as a gift from God, and love it as such. He will feel that the true contemplation of his Saviour lies *in* his worldly business; that as Christ is seen in the poor and in the persecuted, so is He seen and met in the employments which He puts upon His chosen.

4. True humility will lead him to retain his worldly employment. He will remember that he who would be great must be servant of all, and that his Lord Himself washed His disciples' feet.

5. Diligence in his business will keep him from vain and unprofitable thoughts. He will have no time to brood over insults, or to become enfeebled by barren sorrow.

6. It may be a natural desire to wish to retire from our business at the close of life, but it is not always a religious one.

III.

Recreation.

By the Very Rev. Dean Goulburn.

There is no truth more certain than this, that religion is designed to leaven our *whole* life. If recreation is a constituent part of life, recreation must be capable of being sanctified. It is for the mind what sleep is for the body. The principle by which alone any recreation can be sanctified is this of the Apostle—he must bring it within the great scope of God's service. The great point is the intention of the heart. If we can say, "To the service of God I have determined to devote all my faculties of body and soul; recreation, without which neither body nor soul can be healthy, I shall take, because it is subservient to this great object." As to the form which recreation may take, it must, in the first place, be in itself *innocent.* Like food, it must also be *wholesome.* What is good for my neighbour may be an injury to me, my moral temperament differing from his. Thirdly, the more *amusing* amusements are the better. If there is little time for amusement, then let it be thoroughly refreshing. Two obvious counsels may be given in conclusion. All excess in recreations must be avoided. Our longer periods of leisure should be made to pay to God the tax of additional devotion: our prayers should be proportioned to our superfluous time.

IV.

Christianity and Art.

By the Right Rev. Alfred Barry, D.D.

Art is an effort to copy the Divine power of creation. It can *create* nothing, whether of matter or of force. It can only combine the various elements of matter and force together, and impress on them new forms of beauty and usefulness. Art is an imitation of God. The gospel cannot denounce or depreciate it.

The gospel may protest against the exclusive devotion to—the idolatry of—art. So did Savonarola at the Renaissance. Art is given to aid man in working out the perfection of his individual nature, to conduce to that collective progress which we call civilisation. Christianity may guide and stimulate its exercise.

1. *Material Art.* Art ministers to the comfort of the bodily life in the supply of food, furniture, dress, etc. The gospel teaches us to keep these things in their place, not to abstain, but to be temperate; using but not abusing. On the one hand, it protests against the worship of a material civilisation as the whole end of life; on the other,

it urges our wealthy men to employ these material powers in the elevation of the masses.

2. *Civil and Social Art.* Art serves to stimulate social activity, to give scope for the diffusion of thought and emotion through great masses of men. The steamship and railway, the telegraph and telephone, the printing press, stand on a higher level than those products of art which minister to the mere bodily welfare. The gospel looks with sympathy on these as God's marvellous gifts. But they are only means; and may be abused to base ends. They open up greater temptations, deeper responsibilities. The gospel teaches that these must be the means of conquering sin, spreading light, maintaining truth and righteousness.

3. Art discerns and creates beauty—the art of the painter, sculptor, architect, the musician and the poet. This is a higher function. It is the mind and soul of God speaking to our minds and souls. It lays hold of the imagination; it comes nearest to inspiration. Yet even this highest form of art may be perverted to sensual, worldly, selfish uses. So Paul saw it in Athens. But Christianity lays hold of art, restores to it purity, breathes into it the conception of infinity, and through this the aspiration of something higher than can be realized on earth. It has changed the conception of art from being looked on as a mere culture of human nature, to be recognised as a means of discerning the glory and beauty of God's creation, and so opening it to an inspiration from God Himself, and a showing forth of the glory of God.

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

MEN eat, and drink, and do all manner of things, with all their might and main; but how many of them do they do to the glory of God? No, this is the fault,—the especial curse of our day, that religion does not mean any longer, as it used, the service of God,—the being like God, and showing forth God's glory. No; religion means now-a-days the art of getting to heaven when we die, and saving our own miserable souls from hell, and getting God's wages without doing God's work,—as if that was godliness,—as if that was anything but selfishness; as if selfishness was any better for being everlasting selfishness.—*C. Kingsley.*

THE modern idea of some acts being religious and some secular is neither here nor elsewhere recognised by St. Paul. No act of life is in itself either religious or secular. The quality of each act depends on the spirit which guides it, and the motives from which it springs.—*Teignmouth Shore.*

THE Bible has not so narrow a conception of revelation as we sometimes cling to. According to Isaiah xxviii. 23, the rules of good husbandry are a "judgment" taught to the ploughman by Jehovah, part of Jehovah's Torah (ver. 26). The piety of Israel recognised every sound and wholesome ordinance of daily and social life as a direct gift of Jehovah's wisdom, "This also cometh forth from Jehovah of hosts, whose counsel is miraculous and His wisdom great."—*W. Robertson Smith.*

A MAN cannot be so much of a Christian on Sunday that he can afford to be a worldling all the rest of the week. If a steamer put out for Southampton, and go one day in that direction, and the other six days in other directions, how long will it take the steamer to get to Southampton?—*T. de Witt Talmage.*

IN the sense in which some good people use the word "spiritual," the Bible is in many parts extremely unspiritual. They say themselves that they must "spiritualize" many passages in the Old Testament and some in the New.—*R. W. Dale.*

THERE'S such a thing as being over-speritial; we must have something besides gospel i' this world. Look at the canals, an' th' aqueducs, an' th' coal-pit engines, and Arkwright's mills there at Cromford; a man must learn summat beside gospel to make them things, I reckon. But, t' hear some o' them preachers, you'd think as a man must be doing nothing all's life but shutting 's eyes and looking what's a-going on inside him. I know a man must have the love o' God in his soul, and the Bible's God's word. But what does the Bible say? Why, it says as God put His sperrit into the workman as built the Tabernacle, to make him do all the carved work and things as wanted a nice hand. And this is my way o' looking at it: there's the sperrit o' God in all things and all times—week-day as well as Sunday—and i' the great works and inventions, and i' the figuring and the mechanics.—*George Eliot; Adam Bede.*

ONE good man, one man who does not put his religion on with his Sunday coat, but wears it for his working dress, and let's the thought of God grow into him, and through and through him, till everything he says and does becomes religious,—that man is worth a thousand sermons, he is a living gospel.—*C. Kingsley.*

MANY who have visited the settlements of the Moravians, and seen their streets and gardens, but especially their graveyards, must have felt how the breath of God, when it is in men's hearts, can communicate itself to their houses, offices, and grounds, and shed over them a tranquil calm.—*Tholuck.*

I CANNOT allow *Good Words* to close the first year of its existence without addressing a few editorial words to its numerous readers. When I accepted the editorship of this magazine, my principal motive was the desire to provide a periodical for *all the week*, whose articles should be wholly original, and which should not only be written in a Christian spirit, or merely blend the "religious" with the "secular," but should also yoke them together without compromise. It was my earnest wish that our pages should, as far as possible, reflect the everyday life of a good man, with its times of religious thought and devotional feeling, naturally passing into others of healthy recreation, busy work, intellectual study, poetic joy, or even sunny laughter. The tens of thousands who buy the magazine confirm me in the opinion, that I have not misinterpreted the wishes or the wants of the great mass of our Christian community. There are now, I hope, few who will sympathize with the old Scotch woman who remarked to her son, whom she found reading a "religious" book on a week-day, "O Sandy, Sandy! are ye no frichtened to read sic a guid buik as that, an' this no' the Sabbath day?"—*Norman Macleod; Good Words*, vol. i. p. 796.

The Epistle to the Hebrews:

HINTS FOR STUDY.

By the Rev. E. Elmer Harding, M.A.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is second to none of the Epistles of the New Testament in interest and importance. Its application to the needs of the present day has been forcibly brought before us in the two most recent commentaries upon it, published during the past nine months. "Every student of the Epistle to the Hebrews," says Bishop Westcott, "must feel that it deals in a peculiar degree with the thoughts and trials of our own time. . . . The difficulties which come to us through physical facts and theories, through criticism, through wider views of human history, correspond with those which came to Jewish Christians at the close of the apostolic age, and they will find their solution also in fuller views of the Person and Work of Christ." "Epistle, treatise, and homily in one," says Dean Vaughan, "no generation needed it more than our own, and the growing attention paid to it shows that the need is felt."

As a guide to those who are beginning the study of Greek Testament, as well as to more advanced students, the following list of works bearing upon the Epistle has been drawn up by one who had the privilege of beginning his study upon it under the present Bishop of Durham. The list is confined to the modern literature of the Epistle. An enumeration of the chief Patristic Commentaries will be found in Bishop Westcott's masterpiece on the Epistle, Preface, pp. vii., viii. But the Bishop tells us that he has "not attempted to summarize in the notes the opinions of modern commentators. This has been done fairly and in detail by Lünemann." So much, however, has in recent years been written upon this Epistle by many of our ablest theologians, that I venture to hope that the accompanying classification of their works may be of some service to younger Bible students. One work of an earlier date has been added to the list—Owen's *Exercitations*. Another book, less known than it ought to be, is mentioned—*The Apostolic Liturgy and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by the Rev. J. E. Field, M.A. It is a learned and exhaustive commentary on the Epistle in its relation to the Holy Eucharist, with appendices on the liturgy of the Primitive Church. It is the expansion of an article which appeared in the *Union Review* of January 1872, on "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Liturgy of St. James." It will be interesting to students of the liturgies, but few, perhaps, will be willing at the present day to accept the author's conclusion, "We may therefore be satisfied to follow the usual tradition which assigns this Epistle to St. Paul." More will be found to echo the words of Bishop Westcott, that "the anonymous Epistle is a witness to the spiritual wealth of the apostolic age." Inspiration was not necessarily limited to the apostolic circle.

1. Literature.—Progressive Course of Study.

α. Introduction.
- i. *Farrar's* "Messages of the Books." Discourse XXIV.
- ii. *Salmon's* "Introdcution to the New Testament." Lecture XXI.
- iii. *Godet's* "Studies in the Epistles." Originally appeared in the *Expositor*, April 1888.
- iv. *Bullock's* article in Smith's Bible Dictionary.

β. Commentaries for *Junior* Students.
- i. *Ashwell* in S.P.C.K. Commentary.
- ii. *Davidson* in Handbooks for Bible Classes.
- iii. *Farrar* in Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools.
- iv. *Vaughan:* Greek Text with Notes.

γ. Commentaries for *more advanced* Students.
- i. *Bleek.*
- ii. *Delitzsch.*
- iii. *Kay* in Speaker's Commentary.
- iv. *Rendall:* Greek and English, with Critical and Explanatory Notes.
- v. *Westcott:* Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Essays.

δ. Exposition for *Preachers.*
- i. *Owen's* "Exercitations."
- ii. *Dale:* "The Jewish Temple and the Christian Church."
- iii. *Edwards* in "Expositor's Bible."
- iv. *Maurice:* "Warburtonian Lectures."
- v. *Vaughan* on chap. xi. "The Heroes of Faith."

ε. Apologetic,
- i. *Bruce:* Articles in *Expositor* from March 1888; not yet finished.
- ii. *Westcott:* Articles in *Expositor* from Jan. 1886: "Lessons from the Epistle to the Hebrews." Reprinted in "Christus Consummator."

ζ. Miscellaneous.

Papers read at the Church Congress, Wolverhampton, in Oct. 1887; published in Report, pp. 289–318.
- i. Its bearing upon the study and use of Holy Scripture, especially the Old Testament. *Bp. Westcott.*
- ii. Biblical Study, with special reference to mystical interpretation. *Rev. W. H. Hutchings.*
- iii. Its revelation of the Person and Work of our Lord. *Rev. Preb. Gibson.*
- iv. Its bearing upon the worship of the Christian Church. *Rev. Canon Paget.*
- v. Its message to the world, and the Church of our own time. *Rev. Canon Hoare.*
- vi. Its lessons to the individual Christian. *Rev. F. J. Chavasse.*

η. Liturgical.

Field: Apostolic Liturgy and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

2. Outline for Study.

α. *Doctrinal* Section, chs. i.–x.
- i. Christ superior to the Prophets, ch. i. 1–4.
- ii. ,, ,, ,, Angels, ch. i. 5–ii. 18.
- iii. ,, ,, ,, Moses, ch. iii.
- iv. ,, ,, ,, Joshua, ch. iv.
- v. ,, ,, ,, Aaron, chs. v.–x.

β. *Ethical* Section, chs. xi.–xiii.
- i. Faith, ch. xi.
- ii. Hope, ch. xii.
- iii. Love, ch. xiii.

N.B.—Note the *practical exhortations* which are incorporated in the *Doctrinal* Section, viz.—ii. 1–4.
iii. 7–19.
iv. 11–16.
v. 11–vi. 20.
x. 19–39.

The Last Edition of Delitzsch's "Isaiah."

Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of "Isaiah." By Franz Delitzsch, D.D. Translated from the Fourth Edition. With an Introduction by Prof. S. R. Driver, D.D. Vol. I. T. & T. Clark, 1890.

This work may be considered Delitzsch's last gift to the Christian Church. Within a few months after penning the preface to it, he passed away. A short paper, contributed to the *Expositor* in the autumn of last year, and two or three articles in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* were actually the last literary work of Delitzsch's long career; but this final edition of his "Isaiah" was the last considerable stone added to the building of a lifetime, before the busy master-hand was stilled in death. It is marked by the characteristics which distinguished this great Hebrew scholar from the first. Wide range of learning, minute accuracy in detail, careful observation of all that appeared in the literature of three or four countries touching his subject, complete candour and frank acceptance of new arguments, followed not seldom by a frank acknowledgment of changed views—those characteristics of the true scholar were in Delitzsch combined with many of the qualities of the theologian, the religious insight, the mysticism, and especially the profoundly devout spirit of a man who understood thoroughly the religion as well as the language of the sacred writings he expounded. Such was the general character of the work of one whom many in England loved to call master, and such it continued to be to the end. It is hardly necessary to say that the present writer makes no pretension to review or criticise a work by Delitzsch, but as one who has given some attention to the subject, he has undertaken, at the editor's request, to give some account of the last production of this eminent scholar, and the relation of his critical views on Isaiah to those at present in the ascendant.

The four editions of the commentary on Isaiah are dated respectively 1866, 1869, 1879, and 1889. The substance of the work has remained unaltered throughout, yet every edition has shown signs of the most careful and minute revision on almost every page. As Delitzsch himself says, in each edition of his commentaries he leaves so much that is peculiar to each, that no one becomes quite antiquated by its successors. A careful comparison of the first edition of the "Isaiah" with the last leaves one wondering at the "infinite capacity for taking pains" which marks the true artist, whether be commentator, painter, or architect. On the first page we find a new explanation of the Massoretic name for the prophetic portion of the Old Testament Scriptures, and on the last, certain significant changes in the language used concerning Asshur and Egypt, and the cycle of prophecy contained in chaps. xxiv.–xxvii. Such changes are but representative of scores which we have marked, but which we only refer to here in passing, to illustrate the amount of patient revision which every line of the commentary has undergone.

Our readers will be most interested in Delitzsch's views on the unity of the Book of "Isaiah" and the degree to which he was brought to modify his earlier opinions. After rapidly sketching the history of criticism during the last half-century, he says: "If we take our stand on this eminence, then the Book of Isaiah is an anthology of prophetic discourses by different authors. I have never found anything inherently objectionable in the view that prophetic discourses by Isaiah and by other later prophets may have been blended and joined together in it on a definite plan. Even in that case the collection would be no play of chance, no production of arbitrary will. These later prophets so closely resembled Isaiah in prophetic vision, that posterity might on that account well identify them with him. In view of this fact, the whole book rightly bears the name of Isaiah, inasmuch as he is, directly and indirectly, the author of all these prophetic discourses; his name is the correct common-denominator for this collection of prophecies, which, with all their diversity, yet form a unity; and the second half particularly (chaps. xl.–lxvi.) is the work of a pupil who surpasses the master, though he owes the master everything. Such may possibly be the case. It seems to me even probable, and almost certain, that this may be so; but indubitably certain it is not, in my opinion, and I shall die without getting over this hesitancy. For very many difficulties arise." Delitzsch then proceeds to describe these difficulties, some of the chief of which are, that there is no parallel to such a phenomenon in the other canonical books of prophecy, that history knows nothing of such a series of prophets, their very names and existence —if they ever existed—having been forgotten, as well as the fact that the type and style of the disputed prophecies by no means stands in sharp contrast to the remainder.

A somewhat decided change of view is here perceptible as compared with the confident advocacy of unity which marked earlier editions, and it is a mark of the freshness and activity of mind of Delitzsch that in advanced age he was so open to conviction and so ready to acknowledge any modification of views previously expressed. But the cautious judgment here given stops considerably

short of giving up the unity of the book as incredible. Convinced, on the whole, that more hands than one have been at work in the composition of these prophecies, and that peaks, which had seemed from a distance to blend into one lofty mountain, must in reality be distinguished,—convinced, moreover, that a believer in the Divine inspiration of the utterances loses nothing by the change, the truly prophetic and supernatural character of the prophecies remaining unaltered, Delitzsch does not hesitate to avow that the balance of argument seems to him to lie that way. But he recounts at length the arguments on the other side, which to the last he asserts have never been met by the advocates of the theory of composite authorship. Delitzsch's own view clearly is, that it is quite possible to pay too much attention to these critical questions, which can never be closed beyond the reach of controversy. He fears lest the Divine word should "completely disappear behind the tangled thorns of an overgrown criticism." He is quite prepared to grant to criticism "its well-founded rights," but objects strongly to that "naturalistic contemplation of the world which demands foregone conclusions of a negative character," and is chiefly anxious that whether one Isaiah, or many, be recognised, the God who spake by the prophets should not be forgotten, nor the perennial significance of divinely inspired words be overlooked.

It would, perhaps, be impossible to describe an attitude towards current criticism of the Old Testament more sound and satisfactory than this. It is as foolish as it is useless to take a stand upon traditional views, and meet all the investigations of critics with an unintelligent *non possumus*. If it can be shown that the utterances of many men of God, extending over a considerable period have become blended under one great name, our belief in prophecy and the God who spoke through many voices will not fail us. If the sublime words of the "Deutero-Isaiah" were not penned centuries before the exile, the character of the prophecy is but little altered, and its value as a divinely inspired composition can hardly be said to be lessened. But caution is needed before accepting current fashionable hypotheses, and the tone adopted by Delitzsch is more conservative and decidedly less confident than that adopted by the two eminent English scholars—Canons Cheyne and Driver—to whom he has dedicated this volume. These are the days of "victorious analysis." It is the fashion at present to pull to pieces, confidently to mark out the precise share taken by each one of a dozen several writers or editors in a composition which for centuries has been held to be the work of one man. Great is the power of analysis, and marvellous indeed is the acumen of modern critics; indeed, it needs no little courage just now to hint that critical analysis is anything short of omnipotent. A reaction, however, is probably not far off, and the balance will ere long be redressed. Meanwhile, lesser critics may at least learn from Delitzsch not to allow the matter of the sacred text to be neglected, while incessant battle is being waged concerning its form, date, and authorship.

It is hardly needful to point out that the literature of the subject is in this edition brought fully up to date. Little seems to have escaped Delitzsch's eye, and as regards English literature, not only do substantial works on Isaiah, like those of Cheyne and G. A. Smith, receive due recognition, but reference is made to articles in the *Church Quarterly* and elsewhere, and a passing remark of the late Bishop Patteson, in one of his published letters, draws forth comment. The bibliographical table on p. 45 is useful. Space will not permit us to point out some of the chief changes we had marked in the body of the commentary. The views taken of the prophecy concerning Babylon in chaps. xiii., xiv., and that concerning Tyre in chap. xxiii., are illustrations of these. Here and there a long note is added, as, for example, the reference to Pentateuchal criticism on p. 2. On the other hand, some omissions have been made, chiefly of technical matter, so that the length of the whole work remains substantially the same.

English readers may well be grateful to Messrs. Clark for bringing within their reach this valuable work, the last fruit of a tree that has borne so many ripe and rich clusters. Characteristically modest is the author's estimate of it, who tells us, with a touch of pathos, that the book, complete as he has striven to make it, "will, sooner or later, in my eyes shrink into a very imperfect and insignificant production. Of one thing only do I think I may be confident, that the spirit by which it is animated comes from the good Spirit that guides along the everlasting way." We may conclude by saying that, in our opinion, those who would enter into the meaning of that Spirit as He spake long ago by Isaiah, words of comfort and hope which have not lost their significance to-day, cannot find a better guide, one more marked by learning, reverence, and insight, than Franz Delitzsch.

W. T. Davison.

It is a pleasure to receive every month **Partridge & Co.'s Magazines.** They are mostly old favourites. If we had any power we should gladly put them into the hands of those whom they suit. First, the *Infant's Magazine*, and then the *Children's Friend* and the *Band of Hope Review;* the *Mother's Companion* for the mother, the *British Workman* for the father, and the *Family Friend* for all; for the aged, the *Friendly Visitor;* lastly, *A1* covers the whole range of life, and seems to aim at suiting everybody.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

WITH NOTES.

By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D. MACMILLAN & Co., 1890.

THIS is the work of a good Greek scholar; such a work as might be expected from one who had occupied the position of a master or headmaster in a great English school. The writer in his preface mentions that in recent years four commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews have appeared, all written by men who were, "some thirty years ago, masters in one great school." He is one of the four, and Bishop Westcott is another. The fact is interesting, as showing the extent to which the Epistle referred to has engaged the attention of biblical students, and also as throwing some light on the distinctive character of English commentaries. They are commentaries on *words* rather than on *thoughts*. This is true more or less of them all; it is very specially true of the one before us. It is a schoolmaster's commentary on an Epistle which more than almost any book of the New Testament calls for the illuminating influence of theological or philosophical thought. It is not a contribution to an answer to the question—Why was the Epistle written, and what is its meaning in the light of the circumstances? It does not even aim at being this, but merely at throwing light on the meaning of Greek words, as illustrated by classic and Hellenistic usage. A book of this kind, from a competent hand, is certainly not without value, though its importance is quite subordinate; for the urgent need of the Church in connection with this Epistle is not verbal commentary, but aid to clear insight into its drift and spirit. From Dr. Vaughan's work no such aid can be obtained.

That being once for all understood, this book may be consulted with advantage in regard to what it undertakes to do. It will be found a useful companion to the dictionary, and the grammar in the study of the Epistle. The writer knows at first hand all that relates to exact verbal interpretation, and supplies from classic authors, the Septuagint, and other New Testament books, copious examples of the usage of words. The materials are the accumulations of many years study. It is, as the author informs us, the production of "one whose time has been largely given for the last thirty years to the work of explaining the Greek Testament to a long succession of students for ordination." A book having such a history one is prepared to receive with sincere respect, and the perusal of its pages only tends to deepen the feeling. In multitudes of instances the notes are of great value, and in not a few cases of quite exceptional value. Among those which have struck me may be mentioned the discussions of the words παραρυῶμεν (ii. 1), πνεύματος ἁγίου (ii. 4), δοκῇ (iv. 1), τετραχηλισμένα (iv. 13), κεφάλαιον (viii. 1), εὐπερίστατον (xii. 1).

There are crucial passages in the Epistle which may be taken as tests of exegetical insight. Judged by these, the work before us is not so satisfactory. In ii. 9 the clause ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ. greatly puzzles the writer. He first suggests that it may be explanatory of "the suffering of death," and renders the verse: "Him who had been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, for the sake of suffering death,—in other words, that by the grace of God He might taste death for every man,—Him we now behold crowned with glory and honour." But sensible that this arrangement of the construction is liable to objection on account of "its interrupted and dislocated order," he is driven to adopt the more common rendering, "that by the grace of God *He may have tasted* death for every man." Of course, he is fully aware that it is very difficult to find a parallel to this rendering of γεύσηται, as having a retrospective meaning. The simple solution that Christ was crowned with glory and honour in being appointed to die for others does not seem to have entered his mind as a possibility. His embarrassment, however, may be regarded as in favour of that solution.

On the word προσερχώμεθα (iv. 16), the writer remarks: "A great word in this Epistle. . . . *Let us be drawing nigh.* This is religion in exercise—*a constant coming to God.* It is the opposite to that *aloofness* from God, which is either the original condition of the fallen or else the beginning of apostasy in the Christian." Homiletically good; but the contrast in the mind of the writer of the Epistle is that between Christianity and Leviticalism.

Πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν (vi. 28). The comment is: "We might have expected the simple genitive after πρόδρομος. But the insertion of ὑπὲρ is reverential, and marks the disparity of the πρόδρομος and the followers." The writer of the Epistle really means to claim for Christians identity of privilege with Christ. They can follow where He goes. In contrast to the people of Israel under the Levitical system, who stood without while the high priest entered the holy place alone. The ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν qualifies εἰσῆλθεν, and refers to Christ's entering as priest in our behalf.

Θυμιατήριον in ix. 4 is taken to mean the altar of incense, but with hesitation, out of regard to the "difficulties" connected with that interpretation. "On the whole, with whatever sense of the difficulties, we must regard the θυμιατήριον as standing here for the altar of incense." It is not perceived that the writer of the Epistle meant to use the difficulty of defining the position of the altar of incense as a means of pressing home to his readers the defective character of the Levitical religion.

The radical defect was the existence of the veil, and the *aloofness* it symbolized.

These samples suffice to show the weak side of this work. Its author has not grasped the fact that the thoughts of the Epistle are not theological commonplaces, but new truths freshly conceived and eloquently expounded for the benefit of readers whose minds are dominated by an antiquated religion and blind to the worth of Christianity.

A. B. Bruce.

Index to Modern Sermons and Expositions.

MATTHEW.

i.—Barrett (A. C.), Companion to the Greek Test., 125.
Bleek (F.), Introduction to the New Test., i. 275, 308.
Delitzsch (F.), Old Test. Hist. of Redemption, 181.
Edersheim (A.), Jesus the Messiah, i. 144.
Ellicott (C. J.), Historical Lectures, 57.
Gibson (J. M.), St. Matthew (Expos. Bible), 1.
Lange (J. P.), Life of Christ, i. 350, 366.
Scrymgeour (W.), Lessons on the Life of Jesus, 1.
Expositor, 2nd Series, iii. 116 (Gibson).

i. 1.—Alexander (Bp. W.), Leading Ideas of the Gospel, 1.
Blomfield (A.), Sermons in Town and Country, 60.
Delitzsch (F.), Old Test. Hist. of Redemption, 9.
Girdlestone (C.), Twenty Parochial Sermons, ii. 1.
Goodwin (H.), Parish Sermons, iii. 183.
Leathes (S.), Bampton Lectures, 1874, 180.
Lennep (H. J. van), Bible Lands, 498.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Revision of the New Test., 100.
Nicholson (E. B.), Our New New Test., 25.
Parker (J.), Ecce Deus, 10.
Roberts (A.), Companion to the R. V. of the N. T., 17.
Robinson (W.), Biblical Studies, 104.
Sanday (W.), Gospels in the Second Century.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 218.
Wright (A.), Composition of the Gospels, 113.
Clergyman's Magazine, New Series, vii. 19 (Kendall).
Homiletic Quarterly, i. 368.
Preacher's Monthly, viii. 329.
Sermon Bible, v. 1.

i. 1–17.—Bleek (F.), Introduction to the New Test., i. 114.
Keim (T.), Jesus of Nazara, ii. 25.
Kitto (J.), Daily Bible Illustrations, vii. 74.
Lange (J. P.), Life of Christ, v. 215, 224.
M'Clellan (J. B.), The Four Gospels, 377, 408, 541.
Neander (A.), Life of Christ, 19, 20.
Parker (J.), Inner Life of Christ, i. 1.
Ryle (J. C.), Expository Thoughts on St. Matthew, 1.
Contemporary Pulpit, 1st Series, iii. 182 (Davies).
Homilist, i. 20.

i. 1–25.—Homiletic Quarterly, i. 368.

i. 2.—Delitzsch (F.), Biblical Psychology, 334.

i. 2, 3.—Lightfoot (J. B.), Revision of the New Test., 160.

i. 2–6.—Sanday (W.), Gospels in the Second Century.

i. 2–16.—Horton (R. F.), Inspiration and the Bible, 69.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the New Test., 46.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of New Test. Greek, 141.

i. 3.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, vi. 185.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Revision of the New Test., 160.
Salmon (G.), Introduction to the New Test., 81, 199.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 218, 219.

i. 5.—Farrar (F. W.), Early Days of Christianity, i. 460, ii. 83.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 219.

i. 6.—Lightfoot (J. B.), Revision of the New Test., 102.
M'Clellan (J. B.), The Four Gospels, 623.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the New Test., 26.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 218, 308.

i. 7.—Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 217.

i. 8.—M'Clellan (J. B.), The Four Gospels, 623.
Scrivener (F. H.), Criticism of the N. T., 282, 284.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 218.

MATTHEW.

i. 8.—Westcott and Hort, Greek Test., ii., Appendix, 7.
Wright (A.), Composition of the Gospels, 148.

i. 11.—Kuenen (A.), Religion of Israel, iii. 168.
Scrivener (F. H.), Notes on St. Matthew, 131.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 218.
Westcott and Hort, Greek Test., ii., Appendix, 7.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 234.

i. 11, 12.—M'Clellan (J. B.), Four Gospels, 623.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 87.
Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, v. 382.

i. 13.—Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 216.

i. 15.—Lightfoot (J. B.), Galatians, 269.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 27.
Lennep (H. J. van), Bible Lands, 498.

i. 16.—Norton (J. N.), Golden Truths, 46.
Scrivener (F. H.), Criticism of the N. T., 201.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 219, ii. 262.
Sermon Bible, v. 2.

i. 17.—Barrett (A. C.), Companion to Greek N. T., 128.
Hausrath (A.), New Test. Times, i. 123.
Parker (J.), Ecce Deus, 10.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 218.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 137.
Pulpit Comm.: Ruth, 64 (Morison).

i. 18.—Andrews (S. J.), Life of our Lord, 64.
Barrett (A. C.), Companion to the Greek N. T., 47.
Buttmann (A.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 315.
Calthrop (G.), Eden to Patmos, 192.
Girdlestone (R. B.), Course of Sermons, i. 89.
Hammond (C. E.), Textual Criticism of the N. T., 66.
Lange (J. P.), Life of Christ, i. 374.
M'Clellan (J. B.), Four Gospels, 623, 624.
Nicholson (E. B.), Our New New Test., 26.
Salmon (G.), Introd. to the New Test., 46.
Sanday (W.), Gospels in the Second Century.
Scrivener (F. H.), Criticism of the N. T., 369, 453, 464, 493.
Scrivener (F. H.), Notes on St. Matthew, 132.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 57, 172.
Wace (H.), Gospel and its Witnesses, 47.
Westcott and Hort, Greek Test., ii., Appendix, 7, 8.
Winer (G. B.), Gram. of N. T. Greek, 260, 570, 769.
Wright (A.), Composition of the Gospels, 113.
Church S. S. Mag., 1890, xxvi. 428.
Dickinson's Theological Quarterly, i. 307 (Sears).
Expositor, 2nd Series, ii. 195 (Wace); 3rd Series, i. 120 (Whyte).

i. 18–20.—Ewald (H.), Old and New Test. Theol., 340.

i. 18–23.—M'Clellan (J. B.), Four Gospels, 540.

i. 18–25.—Ewald (H.), Old and New Test. Theol., 320.
Horton (R. F.), Inspiration and the Bible, 73.
Keim (T.), Jesus of Nazara, ii. 70.
Lange (J. P.), Life of Christ, v. 234.
Neander (A.), Life of Christ, 21.
Parker (J.), Inner Life of Christ, i. 10.
Ryle (J. C.), Expository Thoughts on St. Matthew, 5.
Church S. S. Mag., 1890, xxvi. 428 (Hoare).
Clergyman's Magazine, iii. 355.
Homiletic Quarterly, i. 475.
Homilist, i. 22.

On Cats.

By Canon Liddon.

"The Spectator," 17*th January* 1885.

Cats are like oysters, in that no one is neutral about them; every one is, explicitly or implicitly, friendly or hostile to them. And they are like children in their power of discovering, by a rapid and sure instinct, who likes them and who does not. It is difficult to win their affection; and it is easy to forfeit what it is hard to win. But when given, their love, although less demonstrative, is more delicate and beautiful than that of a dog. Who that is on really intimate terms with a cat has not watched its dismay at the signs of packing-up and leaving home! We ourselves have known a cat who would recognise his master's footstep after a three months' absence, and come out to meet him in the hall, with tail erect, and purring all over as if to the very verge of bursting. And another cat we know, who comes up every morning between six and seven o'clock to wake his master, sits on the bed, and very gently feels first one eyelid and then the other with his paw. When an eye opens, but not till then, the cat sets up a loud purr, like the prayer of a fire-worshipper to the rising sun.

Those who say lightly that cats care only for places, and not for persons, should go to the Cat Show at the Crystal Palace, where they may see recognitions between cat and owner that will cure them of so shallow an opinion. When we were last there, one striking instance fell in our way. Cats greatly dislike these exhibitions; a cat, as a rule, is like Queen Vashti, unwilling to be shown, even to the nobles, at the pleasure of an Ahasuerus. Shy, sensitive, wayward, and independent, a cat resents being placed upon a cushion in a wire cage, and exposed to the unintelligent criticism, to say nothing of the fingers, of a mob of sightseers. One very eminent cat, belonging to the Master's Common Room at Christ Church, Oxford, whose size and beauty have on several occasions entailed on him the hard necessity of attending a Cat Show, takes, it is said, three days to recover from the sense of humiliation and disgust which he feels, whether he gets a prize or not. On the occasion to which we refer, a row of distinguished cats were sitting, each on his cushion, with their backs turned to the sightseers, while their faces, when from time to time visible, were expressive of the deepest gloom and disgust. Presently two little girls pushed through the crowd to the cage of one of the largest of these cats, crying, "There's Dick!" Instantly the great cat turned round, his face transfigured with joy, purred loudly, and endeavoured to scratch open the front of the cage, that he might rejoin his little friends, who were with difficulty persuaded to leave him at the show.

No doubt, local attachment is a prominent feature of a cat's mind; and a very good quality it is too. It, however, often gets cats into odd company, as it did those cats whom Baruch mentions as sitting upon the idols of Babylon, if not into serious misfortune. Under this head, our readers should study the story, given by M. Champfleury, of the French *curé's* cat, who was only induced to leave an old presbytery by being put into a bag and dipped in a pond. This attachment to place is closely connected with a cat's fine power of accurate observation. When a piece of furniture has been moved from its accustomed place, all the cats in the house set themselves to examine the phenomenon, with a view to discovering, if possible, its reason. Cats are, we apprehend, inveterate Conservatives. This principle, rather than ill-nature or jealousy, explains their conduct on the arrival of a new companion. They, first of all, tentatively examine it; then, especially if it be a kitten, they all spit at and scratch it. Only after slow approaches and the lapse of three or four days is the new-comer received even provisionally into the circle of established cats; but at the end of a month it is just as secure in its position as is the first Reform Bill in the British Constitution, or any aged peer in the House of Lords. This ready acceptance of accomplished facts illustrates that quality of sagacity in cats upon which M. Champfleury lays stress.

Cats are, however, sometimes strangely at fault. So was Madame Théophile, a red cat with a white breast, pink nose, and blue eyes, who was "on terms of the closest intimacy" with M. Théophile Gautier. When Madame first saw a parrot, she evidently took it for a green chicken, and was preparing to deal with it accordingly. She gradually made her approaches; and at last, with one bound, sprang upon the perch where the parrot was sitting. But the bird, without moving, addressed Madame in a deep bass voice, "As-tu déjeuné, Jacquot?" For this accomplishment the cat was wholly unprepared; after all, it might be a man in disguise. The bird followed up its advantage by further questions, "Et de quoi?" "Du rôti du roi?" and as the cat retired in sheer terror, proceeded to quote French verses, which naturally and utterly completed Madame's discomfiture.

The Sunday School.

The International Lessons for October.

I.

October 5.—Luke xx. 9-19.

The Parable of the Vineyard.

The only verse that needs explaining in this parable is the 18th, "Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken (literally *crushed*); but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder (literally *scatter him as chaff*)." The stone is that spoken of in the previous verse (which is a quotation from Ps. cxviii. 22), "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner." The stone is spoken of as first "rejected"—that is, cast aside, and lying in the way, so that men stumble over it; then as made "the head of the corner"—that is, lifted up and placed in the most honourable part of the building. Jesus is that stone. While Jesus was upon earth, He was despised and rejected of men. This was their loss, not His. They fell upon Him, they suffered much damage and loss; but now He is exalted, and when He comes again in power and judgment, those who still scorn and hate him, He will "fall upon," and will scatter them as chaff.

The Jews who misunderstood and despised him in the days of His humiliation suffered great loss and damage for it; but we know that some of them repented afterwards. They who did not shall endure the greater, even the eternal, destruction when He comes in the glory of His Father and of the holy angels.

There is no doubt that the parable was spoken for the benefit of the Jews, and especially of their teachers, the Scribes and Pharisees; and the lesson is very plain. They or their fathers had rejected the Prophets who had come in the name of God, and now they were about to cast out and even kill the beloved Son of God Himself. Here, therefore, they are warned solemnly that their privileges will be taken from them, and they themselves shall suffer the just punishment of their abuse of these privileges. But immediately we see that the parable reaches to us also. As the Shulammite said, we each have our vineyard to keep—that is to say, our work to do, and our life to live for God. He will call us to account for the things done in the body. To teach us to live for Him, He has sent us also prophets and apostles and martyrs, preachers and teachers. They come in humble guise, perhaps; but when they are pure and true, the conscience and the Spirit of God tell us they are God's messengers. According to our treatment of them, and of their message, shall be our judgment.

This is the lesson for children. God is very good. He gives His Word, which they are taught to read; He sends teachers and preachers, also parents sometimes who are godly, and earnest anxious friends. If they will not listen, He will take these blessings all away, and finally the Son Himself will come to judgment, and He will be a consuming fire to all the workers of iniquity. The Jews cried, "God forbid!" when Jesus spoke of their final loss; and so children are often terrified by Jesus' own words about the final judgment. But it is only the *punishment* they dread; they will not let go the sinful habit: and so one day the stone of righteous judgment falls, and they are scattered as the chaff.

II.

October 12.—Luke xxii. 7-20.

The Lord's Supper.

1. "The day of unleavened bread." On the evening of the 13th of the month Nisan (the 14th was the feast-day), every Jewish father repaired to the fountain to draw pure water with which to knead the unleavened bread. When he returned, he lit a torch and searched every corner of the house to see that not a vestige of leaven was left in it. Such a Jewish father, "bearing a pitcher of water," Peter and John were directed to follow.

2. "Furnished." It would contain little, if anything, more than the *triclinium*, or table in the form of a horse-shoe, with its seats.

3. "With desire I have desired." This is a Hebrew way of saying, "I have greatly desired."

4. "Until it (*i.e.* the Passover) be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." He, the true Paschal Lamb, was about to be sacrificed. By that sacrifice the kingdom of God would be established. Therefore this was the last Passover till the Passover should have its fulfilment in the kingdom of God.

5. "The new testament in my blood." There is a dispute as to whether this word ever means *will* or *testament*. It certainly means *covenant* in most places, and this seems to give the better sense here—the new covenant ratified by the shedding of my blood, as the old covenant made with Abraham was similarly established by blood.

There are many great controversies which still rage over these simple, though majestic, verses. The teacher must exercise his own judgment as to touching upon them. But here is a story which may be told with interest and profit. First, recall that terrible night in Egypt when the Angel of Death passed from house to house, and left the first-born dead behind him; but the homes of the Israelites were spared, for a lamb had been slain and its blood sprinkled on the lintel and door-posts. Tell them, next, how a lamb was slain and a Passover kept by every Hebrew family, year after year, throughout all the ages of their history. Tell them that it was a custom, at a certain point in the feast, for one of the children to rise up and ask his father what the Passover meant, who then told the story of that dreadful night in Egypt, and their deliverance. But tell them that the sacrifice of the lamb was not only a memory, but also a promise. It did not look backwards merely, but pointed forwards also; for that lamb was a type and promise of a Redeemer. Tell them that the death of Jesus delivers from

the power of sin and Satan, through the shedding of His blood on Calvary, as the shedding of the lamb's blood saved their fathers from the hand of the Angel of Death, for "without shedding of blood there is no remission." Then make them read over Jesus' words at the Last Supper again, and they will see the meaning, and begin to feel something of the power of them.

III.

October 19.—Luke xxii. 24–37.

The Spirit of True Service.

1. "There was a strife also among them (the disciples), which of them should be accounted the greatest." It took place, apparently, over the choice of places at the table. Some think that Judas claimed precedence, from his official position. He seems to have found a place, at any rate, next to Jesus, on the left, while John sat on His right.

2. "Benefactors." The title, used by kings, is frequently found on coins of that day. It is a fine-sounding title, but the disciples knew that the sound was hollow.

3. "I am among you as he that serveth." Recall here the beautiful incident related by John (xiii.) of the washing of the disciples' feet.

4. "That ye . . . may sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." No one may say yet what that means. But it is sad that the words are sometimes used to claim that very precedence which Christ is rebuking.

5. "Satan hath desired to have you." The verb is in the aorist or simple past. It describes a past event, and it is stronger than merely "desired," rather "demanded." We may think of such a scene as is described in the first chapter of Job.

6. "I have (omit *have*) prayed for thee." Satan demanded to sift all the disciples. Jesus prayed specially for Simon, perhaps because he was in special danger then, and because he was a fit instrument when turned again (and God loves to do His work by instruments) to bring back and strengthen the rest.

The title given to this lesson is, "The Spirit of True Service." Might it not have been more appropriately called "The Spirit of True Government"? The disciples wanted each to be first, wanted each to rule the rest. Jesus taught them how to be rulers indeed. The true ruler is the self-denying servant. To be the first, He said, become the last; for "the last shall be first," and "he that loseth his life shall gain it."

Jesus knows that the time is coming when the disciples will do so; they will each seek to serve the rest. And so He tells them that they shall become rulers in the kingdom of God, and judges of the twelve tribes of Israel. Was it this promise that taught St. Paul the strange truth that "the saints shall judge the world"? (1 Cor. vi. 2).

When the sons of Zebedee made the request that they might sit on either hand of Christ in His kingdom, He told them, in words of yet deeper solemnity, that the path to honour led through the valley of shame. "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I drink of?" How hard it is to learn that lesson! Scarcely ever is it learnt but by bitter experience. The children will scarcely understand the meaning of it; but so it is.

> "For the clear bells of triumph—a knell,
> For the sweet kiss of meeting—farewell;
> For the height of the mountain—the steep,
> For the waking in heaven—death's sleep."

IV.

October 26.—Luke xxii. 39–53.

Jesus in Gethsemane.

1. "This cup." It is the cup of which He spoke to James and John, the sons of Zebedee. It is the cup of the whole terrible night and morning that lay before Him—the traitor's kiss, the mocking trials, the spitting, the scourging, the cross, but surely above all the moment of the cry, "My God, my God! why hast Thou forsaken me?"

2. "Behold a multitude." The 52nd verse tells us some of those who composed it—"the chief priests and captains of the temple, and the elders." "God forbid!" they cried, these very men, when Jesus spoke of their privileges being taken from them; but yet here they are about to kill the Husbandman's well-beloved Son.

How simple are the words used to describe this unparalleled scene! The youngest child may understand them all. But who is wise enough to understand the scene itself? "Father, if it be possible"—why was it not possible? We can only answer in the Lord's own words: Because this was the hour of the power of darkness.

But let us follow Jesus, and listen and watch with awe and reverence. St. Luke gives us none of the beautiful discourses which He spoke before He left the upper room; nor does he mention the hymn which He sang with the disciples on the eve of His agony. Then He descended the Valley of the Kedron, crossed the brook itself, and entered the garden called Gethsemane, or "the oil-press," as it lay on the slope of the hill Olivet, beyond the city's noise. He had with Him only eleven, for one had gone out into the night alone. Eight of these He leaves outside the garden, taking Peter, James, and John once more with Him. But not even can these three be partners in the agony, and He passes further into the shades of the olive-trees alone. The three sleep for sorrow, but we may look and listen. What a cry it is! and what an agony! "as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground." He prayed more earnestly; but still the prayer is in the spirit of obedience—"Not my will, but Thine be done." The victory is gained. He came not to do His own will, but the Father's; and even in the bitterness of the agony He puts the Father's will first, and so the victory is gained. Now He can meet the traitor calmly, the crown of thorns will be endured, the shout of "Crucify" will hurt Him only for pity's sake of those who madly utter it. One moment only the agony will seem to return, forcing the cry, "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" But the victory is not lost. Immediately will follow the words of quiet confidence and rest, "Into Thy hands I commend my spirit."

Requests and Replies.

What do the latest discoveries show as to the place where the Israelites crossed the Red Sea?—E. Y.

No single definite clue for the solution of this problem could be said to exist until the memorable discovery of the store-city, Pithom, was made by Edward Naville, in 1883, when working under the auspices of the Egyptian Exploration Fund. Naville showed that Pithom was situated by the modern Tell el Maschuta in the well-known Wadi Tumilât. On these important results, and their bearing upon the question of the route of the Exodus, I wrote two articles in *The Expositor*, June and December 1883, with an accompanying map.

Naville also showed that Pithom was the same as Succoth (the Hebraic mode of representing the Egyptian *Thuku* or *Thuket*). Thuku meant first a district, and lastly became the name of the chief city of the district. So far, we have strong definite probability, if not absolute certainty. Brugsch's theory of a route starting from Tanis towards the Serbonian bog, along the shores of the Mediterranean, was thereby finally extinguished, and the identification by Lepsius, Ebers, and others of Ra'mses with Tell el Maschuta, and of Pithom with Abu Suleman (still maintained in the German Bädeker, 1885), were also shown to be untenable.

These results, positive and negative, were most important; but every step onwards in the identification of the chain of outposts in Israel's march is a step from clearness into obscurity, and must be punctuated with notes of interrogation.

1. The biblical account speaks in unmistakable language of an advance to Etham, and subsequent retreat (or "return," Heb. *shûbh*) from the same. Where is Etham? Naville, in his work *Store-city of Pithom* (Trübner, 1885), p. 24, identifies it with the land of Atuma, referred to in Papyrus Anastasi vi.: "We have allowed the tribes of the Shasu of the land of Atuma to pass the stronghold of King Meneptah of the land of Succoth towards the lakes of Pithom of King Meneptah of the land of Succoth, in order to feed themselves and feed their cattle in the great estate of Pharaoh."

But the Egyptian sign for T in *Atuma* corresponds, in most cases, with a Hebrew D. Rougé, Chabas, and Brugsch are, therefore, probably right in identifying *Atuma* with *Edom*. I, accordingly, still adhere to the identification proposed by Brugsch, and supported by abundant illustration in his celebrated *Dict. Géographique*, and adopted by Ebers in his *Durch Gosen zum Sinai*. This explains Etham as the later Hebrew representation of the Egyptian *Chetam*, meaning "stronghold." Egypt possessed several such strongholds; but "it was Lower Egypt, exposed on the side of the East to so many attacks of Semitic peoples, that possessed the most formidable fortresses of the name *Chetam*" (Brugsch). It is from these frontier fortresses that the name wilderness of Shûr (or wall-rampart) was derived—a designation which means the same thing geographically as wilderness of Etham. Comp. Numb. xxxiii. 8, with Exod. xv. 22; also comp. Exod. xiii. 20; Numb. xxxiii. 6.

Towards this barrier, over the modern *El Gisr*, taking the nearest route to Canaan, Israel moved from Succoth, and from thence were compelled, by God's warning voice, to retreat. The entire passage recording these events, Exod. xiii. 17, xiv. 4, is a complex of various documents. On this point, I must refer the reader to my article in *The Expositor*, Dec. 1883, p. 450 foll.

2. *Migdol* we may conjecturally identify (following Ebers, *Durch Gosen*, pp. 523, 526) with the Serapeum. "Here the Pharaohs were obliged to have a fort, so as to guard that part of the sea and prevent the Asiatics of the desert from using this temporary gate to enter Egypt, to steal cattle and plunder the fertile land around Pithom" (Naville).

3. *Baal-zephon* is identified by Naville with a hill on the Asiatic side, *Shekh Ennedek* or *Hanaidik* South of Lake Timsah. The relation of these places he defines thus: "On the North-west Pihahîrôth (Pi-keheret), not very far from Pithom; on the South-east Migdol, near the present Serapeum; in front of them the sea, and opposite, on the Asiatic side, Baal-zephon" (Shekh Ennedek). Others, however, identify Baal-zephon with the heights of Jebel 'Ataka, on the western side of the Red Sea, at its northern end. But it is by no means certain that the sea-level remained 3000 years ago where it does now, and it is quite possible that the spot where the Israelites crossed should be sought somewhat further north, in the neighbourhood of the Bitter Lakes.—Owen C. Whitehouse.

---

1. **What is the meaning of "These little ones . . . in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."—Matt. xviii. 10.**

2. **Why are serpents and scorpions said to be amongst the powers of the enemy in Luke x. 19? Can a distinction be drawn between the power of the enemy over one part of creation and another?—D.**

1. The passage has been variously interpreted, but the analogy of Scripture favours the meaning that the guardian-angels of little children are in constant communication with God, *i.e.* that His providence over little children is in some sense special as well

as unremitting. The context is full of figure, and it is possible that the allusions to angels and to "standing before the face of God" (cf. Esther i. 14, and the margin of 2 Kings xxv. 19) should be taken figuratively. "Always" is the emphatic word in the verse, the subject being the greatness and constancy of the Father's love of the children. And Dr. David Brown is said to have thus expounded the passage in a conversation with Irving: "None are allowed to enter without leave into the presence of our sovereign; but the nurses of the royal children have free access whenever they have anything to say about the children."

2. Probably for one or more of the following reasons. The passage appears to contain allusions to Ps. xci. 13, and possibly to Deut. viii. 15. Serpents and scorpions in the animal world, like thorns and thistles in the vegetable, are striking representatives of whatever is hurtful in religion or the active service of God; and they are used in this sense in Old Testament and other early literature, from the story of the First Temptation downwards. This, together with the twofold treatment of serpents in the various systems of animal worship, may perhaps be traced back ultimately to the physical appearance of serpents and scorpions, arousing disgust and terror, and to experience of the deadliness or pain of their venom or sting. There does not seem to be any such distinction in the verse as the further query implies, "serpents and scorpions" being included in and illustrations of the various hurtful agencies that together constitute "all the power of the enemy." If the passage is taken literally, as Acts xxviii. 3 might warrant, prominence must yet be given to its applied meaning, as leading up to the emphatic "Nothing shall by any means hurt you."—R. WADDY MOSS.

At the Literary Table.

A special article on **The Theological Monthly**, under the heading, "The Modern Religious Press," has been twice crushed out, and now we must rest content with this brief note instead. On the principle that one takes kindly to the son of an old friend, we welcomed the offspring of the ancient and highly respected *British and Foreign Review* as soon as he presented himself. He is still young in years, but his youth is vigorous, and there is not one of the monthlies we have more pleasure in receiving. Strictly theological as the name denotes, the difficult middle way is found and maintained with great skill between prelix dulness and flippancy. The editor is an accomplished clergyman of the Church of England, the Rev. Charles Neil, M.A., of Poplar. Here is the attractive bill of contents for September, which may be taken as an average number:—

Wellhausen on the Pentateuch—J. J. Lias.
The Greek Aorist and Perfect—R. F. Weymouth, D. Lit.
The Questions of the Bible—G. Beesley Austin.
The Footprints of Christ—J. W. Burn.
Lead us not into Temptation—F. G. Cholmondeley.

Professor Elmslie's Life (*Professor W. G. Elmslie, D.D.*, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D., and A. N. Macnicoll. London: Hodder & Stoughton) has lain upon the table for some months. A feeling of disappointment has prevented us saying anything about it. There is abundant evidence of skill in the writing of it, but the evidence of haste is as abundant. Our impression has been that the Life should have waited till the Letters could have gone along with it,—especially those which the Rev. A. Harper of Melbourne was known to possess,—and that the Sermons should have been published separately. Mr. Harper's contribution to the *Expositor* for September makes that impression stronger than ever. One thing is certain now that all who have read the Life should see that they read this article also.

Whoever is in trouble about lectures for the coming winter should write to the Rev. George Duncan, D.D., Hornsey Rise Baptist Chapel, Sunnyside Road, N. The marvellous story of his lectureship is before us, and may be had for 2d. from Alexander & Shepheard, Furnival Street.

One of the best features of **The Worker's Monthly** is an article on the Bible and Modern Discovery, which appears every month. That in the September number happens to be on the same subject as Professor Whitehouse's "Reply" in this issue, and it is made more interesting and intelligible by an excellent little map which accompanies it.

"Over the Tea-cups," in the September **Atlantic**, is as lively as ever. The dictator turns preacher this month, and a very queer sermon he preaches. His topic—he does not announce a text—is future punishment. (We have a suspicion that the sea-serpent is going to lose its rights to the dull season.) We shall not argue with Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes. But it will scarcely do for him to say that the doctrine of eternal punishment "got in among the legends of the Church" in the same way as "the interpolation of the three witnesses' text, or the false insertion, or false omission, whichever it may be, of the last fourteen verses of the Gospel of St. Mark."

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December will contain the report upon the Guild papers received, together with particulars of the new work which we hope to enter upon with the New Year.

Early numbers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will contain articles by Professor J. Rawson Lumby, D.D., Cambridge; Professor S. D. F. Salmond, D.D., Aberdeen; Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Oxford; The Dean of Gloucester; Principal C. H. Waller, M.A., London; and the Rev. F. H. Woods, B.D., Oxford.

Mr. Murray has just issued the Bampton Lectures for 1890. The Lecturer, it will be remembered, was Archdeacon Watkins of Durham, and the subject is the literary and critical problems of the Fourth Gospel. *The* problem of the Fourth Gospel is not the authorship. That may be considered settled for the present as far as English scholarship is concerned. It is the *mode of thought* of this Gospel, so different from the Synoptic, yet so assured, so sustained throughout. Archdeacon Watkins has seen this. St. John's unique glory is that he discerned the need of *translation*, not of words only, but of thought, the translation of the memoirs of unlettered fishermen and peasants into forms of thought which might appeal to the minds of another place and another time, minds that had tasted of speculation, religious and philosophical. He made the translation, and met the need; and yet St. John's is the Gospel in which modern fishermen and peasants take most delight. It is an interesting problem, but it cannot be said to be pressing yet.

The most pressing problem in New Testament criticism is the origin and mutual relation of the Synoptic Gospels. It is also the most difficult. Speaking from the Divinity Chair of Dublin University, Dr. Salmon acknowledged his reluctance to enter into this subject. "Not that I share the feelings of some who regard their belief in the inspiration of the Gospels as precluding any such inquiry. My reluctance," he said, "to enter with you upon this inquiry arises solely from my sense of its extreme difficulty." But to the true student of God's Word, "difficulty" is like Mirabeau's "impossible;" it is a "blockhead of a word." It is with this Book as it is with the Book of Nature. If God has more light to break forth from His Word, it is not otherwise than through the resolute and reverent pains which we bestow upon it.

The origin of the Gospels is, however, a problem of such unusual perplexity, that one should endeavour to approach it by the best available path. For much depends upon one's approach. Our own experience was not fortunate in this respect. Our first serious attempt to grapple with the problem was made over the tenth volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and Dr. Abbott's terrible article there. Any of the general "Introductions to the New Testament" were better than that—Dods, Salmon, Weiss, Bleek, or even Davidson. Even Rushbrooke's *Synopticon* itself were preferable, as

at some stage it is indispensable. Better than these, however, is Abbott and Rushbrooke's *Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels* (Macmillan, 1884, 3s. 6d.), a work which has introduced many a New Testament student in these recent years, and not unpleasantly at all. But there is not one of these that in our judgment can compete for this particular purpose with Mr. Wright's *Composition of the Four Gospels*, just issued by Macmillan (*The Composition of the Four Gospels: A Critical Inquiry*. By the Rev. Arthur Wright, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, Cambridge. Macmillan, 1890, 5s.). Mr. Wright contributes one of our "Replies" this month. For we were engaged upon his book, and much interested in it, when the "Request" came in, and we at once sent it to him. We have printed the Request, as well as the Reply, in full. The one indicates the pressure of the problem, the other the lines upon which a solution should be sought. But the best Reply is Mr. Wright's new book.

When a new book on an old perplexity appears, "What is the writer's conclusion?" is the question that is asked. But in such inquiries that is one of the smallest matters, and we shall not answer it now. Probably no scholar has spoken the final word yet on any part of this intricate subject, though it is pleasant to see Mr. F. H. Woods in *Studia Biblica* (vol. ii. p. 94) express the hope that critics are about to come to "an agreement upon this one point," viz. "that the common tradition upon which all the three Synoptics were based is substantially our St. Mark, as far as *matter*, *general form*, and *order* are concerned." The chapter in Mr. Wright's book which will be read with most interest is probably the last, under the title, "The Inspiration of the Gospels." For here lies to many minds the real importance of the inquiry into the origin of the Gospels: it touches so closely the doctrine of inspiration. It does touch that doctrine closely. There is material enough here to fight the whole battle of inspiration, without once trenching upon the criticism of the Old Testament. There is no possible theory of inspiration but may be put to the test by the phenomena which the three earliest Gospels present. Quite recently we have seen that here—upon the question of discrepancies in the Gospels—most of the points at issue may become intelligible to minds which have no knowledge of or interest in Old Testament criticism, and not merely intelligible but extremely vital and disputable. Therefore it is that, notwithstanding the Bishop of Durham's expectation that for some time study will concentrate itself on the Old Testament, there are critics even of the Old Testament who look to the phenomena of the Gospels to provide that "workable" theory of inspiration which they hope to see established.

Professor T. Witton Davies of Haverfordwest contributes a paper to the September issue of the *Old and New Testament Student* on "Leprosy." He agrees with Sir Erasmus Wilson, Sir R. Bennett, and others, that modern leprosy, such as that of which Damien died, is an entirely different disease from the leprosy of the Bible, and ought to go by a different name. The characteristics of modern leprosy are sores both on the outside of the skin and also in the inside, disease of internal organs, as the liver, the kidneys, and alimentary canal, and waste of limb, which only ends with death. "This leprosy," says Professor Davies, "has been described by travellers in language strong and hard to read; yet from what I saw in Egypt and in Palestine, I consider no words too strong in which to set forth its awfulness. I have seen the open sores, the deformities of face and hands, the poor creatures going about with several of their limbs altogether gone." The leprosy spoken of in Leviticus and throughout the Bible is an entirely different disease. There is no mention of loss or even deformity of limb. The only points in which they resemble one another is that the skin is affected in both, and that both are loathsome. "Nothing is more clear than that there are many kinds of leprosy referred to in the Bible, but all of them are diseases of the skin, more or less serious, none of them being particularly perilous to life." The confusion of the two diseases, and the application of the one name, leprosy, to both, has been traced to the Arab physicians. But the distinction, which is now known to be real in fact, should be maintained in name; and Sir Erasmus Wilson suggests that we should follow the Greeks by keeping "Leprosy" for the Bible disease and "Elephantiasis" for modern leprosy. The Bible

leprosy is in Hebrew *tsâra'ath* (צָרַעַת), which the LXX. translate by *lepra* (λέπρα), and *lepra* is the word in the New Testament; so that the suggestion would accord well with biblical language.

It has been much debated of late whether leprosy is contagious. Whatever may be said of modern leprosy (*elephantiasis*), Professor Davies holds that Bible leprosy is not. "There is no instance in Scripture of the disease being caught by contact with another." What, then, is the meaning of "unclean" and the "several house"? Mr. Davies replies that the word "unclean" has a special meaning in the Mosaic law; many healthy animals were "unclean;" while separation (which was not universal—witness the cases of Naaman and Gehazi) was resorted to because of the extreme unpleasantness of the disease, and as a lesson in cleanly habits. Nor is Bible leprosy hereditary. At least there is no instance given where it was hereditary, and the want of such instance is strong evidence that it was not. Professor Davies concludes: "In many modern sermons, references are made which apply to modern leprosy only, and it is to be feared that many of us have stock sermons which require altering in this direction; but we had better be correct, however many popular sermons we spoil."

To preach is one thing: to preach on preaching is a more difficult thing: but surely the superlative of difficulty is reached when one has to preach on preaching in a place where great men preach on preaching every year, and have their sermons published. Nevertheless, Dr. A. J. F. Behrends, the Yale Lecturer on Preaching for 1890, has just issued a volume, under the title of *The Philosophy of Preaching*, which will stand comparison in interest and real value with any course of lectures on preaching yet published (London: R. D. Dickinson, 1890). "The Philosophy of Preaching" is not the most descriptive title that could have been chosen; that name properly belongs to the first two chapters only. "The Principles of Preaching" would have covered the whole book; but it may be that some other of the numerous courses of Yale Lectures on Preaching has already appropriated that title.

Dr. Behrends' book (of which we may remark parenthetically that it is worth seeking out as a specimen of beautiful printing) is eloquent throughout; but it is most eloquent in the chapters which deal with the "spiritual element" in preaching. Here we have a forcible exposition of the words of St. Paul in Romans viii. 6,—"To be spiritually minded (literally, 'the mind of the spirit,' τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος) is life and peace." He says: "In defining spirituality as a fixed mental and moral habit, to be carefully distinguished from ecstasy or from emotional excitement, having its *rational* ground in the clear discernment of what God and man are in their essential nature and in their mutual relations, and its *ethical* quality in the voluntary and habitual subjection of the conscious and active life to the judgments which such discernment forms, I have propounded no theory of my own. I have simply given to the language of Scripture its natural force. Spirituality is, in the carefully selected phraseology of St. Paul, φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, 'the mind of the Spirit.' The word φρόνημα has no exact English equivalent. It is not synonymous with νοῦς, the equivalent of our word 'understanding' or 'reason,' the faculty of rational perception and judgment. Our nearest approach to such a use of the word 'mind' as makes it reflect the meaning of φρόνημα, is in the frequent popular saying, 'I have a great mind to do this or that,' a phrase which not only expresses a rational judgment, but also announces an intention. . . . The 'mind' in you is what you are in your thoughts, desires, and aims. It is the man in the centre of his personality, stripped of all that is seeming and accidental. . . . And to be spiritually minded is to have the thoughts, the desires, and the aims of the Spirit, to survey and measure all things from the centre of the invisible and the eternal, judging yourself as God judges you, treating your fellow-men as God would have you treat them, estimating life as God estimates it, honouring God as He deserves to be honoured."

One of the chapters in Dr. Behrends' Yale Lectures is entitled "The Personal Element in Preaching." There he says: "As a rule, audiences are more responsive than sympathetic. Often they are cold and critical, if not positively

hostile. When at their best they wait to be moved, and they can be powerfully and permanently moved only by words that convey strong personal conviction, and provoke an instant affirmative response. This is the only personal element which has any legitimate place in the theory of preaching." We bear glad witness that the *offensive* personal element is absent from these lectures. So consistently is it absent, indeed, that the few sentences of personal biography in the last chapter come upon us with the pleasure of freshness and novelty. "When, twenty-five years ago, I was graduated from the theological seminary, and ordained as pastor over a quiet suburban church on the banks of the Hudson River, I determined that my first work should be a close and patient study of the Person of Christ. I felt that I must know who my Master was. The first book I purchased was Dorner's *History of the Person of Christ*, which still remains the best monograph on the subject. For more than two years I plodded along, reading right and left, as my time and resources would permit, in systematic and historical theology, with close and constant reference to the Gospels and Epistles as written in their chronological order. I have never regretted the choice I made. Nor have I regretted the studies which followed it, when I made Müller's monograph on the Doctrine of Sin the subject of an equally close reading. I doubt whether a theological graduate can do better now than to begin his pastoral studies with Christology. Until that is mastered, I would shelve eschatology. For in my deliberate judgment, the constitution of our Lord's Person is the one thing on which the most definite instruction is needed, and with regard to which there is a subtle and insidious tendency in modern thought to depart from the New Testament representation."

We could wish that the American students who are trained under Dr. Behrends' Lectures would not lose sight of their excellent literary style. The published sermons of American preachers do not often attain the dignity of literature. They are hard to read. We have no doubt that the *Homiletic Review*, which is conducted with great spirit and resource, publishes the very best sermons to be had every month. Yet the sermons are decidedly the weakest feature of the magazine, and, in our judgment, do not compare for a moment with what a similar selection would be in England, or even in Scotland alone. And the volumes of published American sermons of outstanding merit, which have reached this country, are very few. There are, without going so far back as to Bushnell's *New Life*, Dr. Phillips Brooks's three volumes, published by Macmillan; Dr. Newman Smyth's and Dr. Munger's; Dr. Van Dyke's *Reality of Religion*, which Fisher Unwin issues; Shedd's two volumes, especially *Sermons to the Natural Man;* Dr. Marvin Vincent's *God and Bread*, published by James Clarke; and—well, we cannot recall any more that "a well-selected library" need include. Henry Ward Beecher's? No. Magnificent in delivery as they were, they will not read, and it needs no inspiration to prophesy that they will not live. But there is another volume, just fallen into our hands, which we feel inclined to add to the list. It goes by the title of the *Calvary Pulpit*, for the Sermons were preached in the Calvary Baptist Church, New York, by the Rev. Robert S. MacArthur (Funk & Wagnalls; 1890, 4s.). Like almost all American sermons they have the flavour of the pulpit much more than of the study. We are sure it was a pleasure to hear Mr. MacArthur preach them: it is not quite such a pleasure to read them. For one thing, the sentences are too sharp and short. But there is careful expository work, breadth of sympathy, definite evangelical doctrine.

The Saturday Review of 20th September has a most appreciative notice of the late Dr. William Wright's *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, just issued from the Cambridge University Press, under the editorship of Professor Robertson Smith. The subject which the reviewer finds most interesting in the book is the discussion of the philological relationship between the Semitic and Aryan languages. It is a curious fact that while scholars are inclined at present to deny any traceable relationship between the languages, they are also, on independent grounds, separating the early homes of the races, removing both from Central Asia, and planting them, the one in Arabia and the other in Southern Russia.

Mr. Gladstone's Forthcoming Book on the Old Testament.

By a Scotch University Graduate.

At the present time, old-fashioned beliefs are more and more brought to the test of reason. From *genuine* criticism, however, true religion has nothing to fear. It is a false Christianity which dreads thorough investigation. But there is, on the one hand, a feverish impatience, which rushes to conclusions based on a very little knowledge or even a semblance of knowledge, and, on the other hand, a lazy toleration of a state of doubt without probing the subject doubted, to the bottom; and of both these tendencies we have to be on our guard. Some recent criticisms, as Mr. Gladstone says, have produced an atmosphere of uncertainty, which we habitually breathe; men begin to "*feel* towards the great foundation books of the Old Testament as if they believed that they were in the main untrustworthy," and are thus in danger of "losing their faith unawares." It is against this "vague, irrational, and unscientific" drifting from doubt to infidelity that Mr. Gladstone protests and pleads.

At the same time, while honouring Mr. Gladstone's motives, we are inclined to doubt his means or his leisure to deal satisfactorily with these matters. Mr. Gladstone does not lay claim to any knowledge of Hebrew; he fancies that this knowledge is rendered unnecessary by our translation. This appears to us a mistake. Mr. Gladstone is equally dependent for his scientific facts on those who have made science their special study; and in this province also he is, like the dumb driven cattle, at the mercy of those who are at home in it. We can scarcely wonder that in his late controversy with Mr. Huxley, the general belief was that Mr. Gladstone had the worst of it. In one respect (see *Good Words*, p. 306), Mr. Gladstone thinks he is in a better position than even the Hebraist and the scientist, to judge of the forms and modes of speech proper for Moses to adopt, being himself a man who, for scores of years, has studied "the means of making himself intelligible to the mass of men." Mr. Gladstone, however, is also a statesman; and it is sometimes the "labour" and possibly the "duty" of such men to envelop their meaning in mystery.

Mr. Gladstone begins his chapter on the Creation with a ready-made theory of the purpose of the narrative. But this reminds one of God's answer to Job. How was Mr. Gladstone initiated in the knowledge of this purpose; and if not, why darken counsel with words?

The account of Genesis, he says, was a creation story for "grown children" or untrained minds; it was the purpose of the Divine Teacher, knowing all the facts of science and all the terms of the Hebrew tongue, to make use of these to teach the most truth to such unlettered masses, and that in the most forcible way, scientific exactness being a matter of minor importance. The great lesson to be impressed upon them by this tale of creation was that men had reached their present level by steps or degrees. According to Mr. Gladstone, there was really no breakage, no want of continuity in these stages, but it was essential to the lesson that the rough outline of the account should be broken up into sections, so that the mind should contemplate the whole as a series of scenes, the attention not being fixed upon the joints which united them, but on the scenes themselves (p. 304). In short, the object of the Mosaic writer is to convey "moral and spiritual" training to childish men; it was a creation story, which might serve as "sound instruction" in the nursery of the world. He discards both the idea that the days of Genesis are literal days, and also the idea that they are definite geological periods or ages, and describes them as "Chapters in the History of Creation," chapters in a lesson book for childish men, intended not to teach truths scientifically, but to serve moral and spiritual ends. The question which he then proposes is whether the biblical story of creation and its doctrines "stand in such a relation to the ascertained facts of natural science as to warrant or require our concluding that, in a manner above the ordinary, the story proceeded from the Author of the visible creation" (*Good Words*, p. 303).

It appears to us that Mr. Gladstone makes some assumptions here in "the vague and unscientific way" which he himself deprecates. The impression made upon our childish mind, when we were young, and possibly also on Mr. Gladstone himself seventy years ago, was that the creation of all things taught in Genesis was not by slow stages as Mr. Gladstone seems to indicate, nor indeed by "a single effort," but, so to speak, by six single efforts on six natural days. Besides, we altogether demur to leaving the first chapter of Genesis as a story for children. On the contrary, some of the deep things of God seem to lie hidden in mystery in this chapter. Does not the writer to the Hebrews speak to mature Christians, when he declares that these days were ages jointed together (τοὺς αἰῶνας κατηρτίσθαι) by the Word of God? Does this mean that they were mere literary divisions in a child's book? Again, does not geology distinguish its periods with equal definiteness, and leave us equally to imagine how the evening of the one period merged into the morning of the next?

In regard to the work of the **First Day** or **Age**, Professor Huxley objects to the statements that the earth was "waste and void," and that "darkness was upon the face of the deep." "Waste is too indefinite," he says, "everything that exists must have a form; and how could that be void which is full of matter? And if there was darkness, where is the likeness to the celestial nebulæ, of which we should know nothing unless they shone through a light of their own?" (*Nineteenth Century*, pp. 202, 203). Now the word *bohu*, translated *void*, is found in Scripture only here and in two other passages (Isa. xxxiv. 11; Jer. iv. 23), joined paronomastically to *tohu*; and in the Septuagint, which Mr. Huxley and Mr. Gladstone would both admit to be free from modern prejudices, the two words are translated "unseen and unformed" (ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος). The translation seems to be endorsed by the writer to the Hebrews, who says that created things did not spring from things *visible* (μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων, Heb. xi. 3). It is true, as Mr. Huxley says, that science knows nothing of a time when the earth was empty, or of a chaos where law did not prevail; but it is open for science to go back to that state which preceded even these luminous nebulæ, and to assert that even *they* were developed. Matter was, no doubt, more and more dispersed in space, as we go back in the boundless past. Visibility implies distinction as well as light. Possibly the genesis of light had something to do with the condensing process of collecting these nebulæ from boundless space; but, at least, the Mosaic account is quite scientific when it connects the evolution of light with motion. "The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters, and God said, Let there be light." In the rapid revolutions of these flowing materials, and possibly in their condensation or collection, light was evolved; and, in so far as these luminous nebulæ were collected, it may be said that God separated the light from the surrounding darkness. The Hebrew word *t'hom*, translated "deep" (the Babylonian *hamat*), is, according to Gesenius, a sea in commotion, or a boundless quantity of "waters," as Moses also calls this "weltering," primitive matter. "No doubt," says Mr. Gladstone, "the idea conveyed by the word 'waters,' is an imperfect idea, though waters are still waters at times when they may be holding vast quantities of solid in solution;" and what better word had Moses at his disposal? Canon Driver describes the scene as "a surging chaos;" and another authority describes matter as being "in an uncompounded, homogeneous, gaseous condition." But Mr. Gladstone thinks that "the grown children," with whom Moses had to do, would have been rather bewildered than instructed by these phrases (*Good Words*, pp. 306, 307). The Greeks called the stuff out of which the universe was made *hylé* (wood); and the Egyptians called it *nu* (water). Possibly, Moses borrowed the word from the Egyptians. At all events, the first day's work was the formation of these nebulous luminosities, which, as we go back in boundless time, may be scientifically presumed to have been less and less distinguishable, and more and more dispersed in space.

In his account of the work of the **Second Day** or **Age**, Mr. Gladstone seems to fall into a serious error. After speaking of the subject of light, he says, "The gradual severance or disengagement of the earth from its vesture, the atmosphere, and of the solid land from the ocean, is continuously handled in vers. 6–10." Now this can only mean that the firmament of heaven, whereby the waters above it were divided from the waters below it, was the atmosphere. If he does not mean this, his explanation of these verses is not intelligible. But if this is his meaning, it would follow that it was in the atmosphere that God set the sun and the moon and the stars (Gen. i. 17). Now Mr. Huxley would object to this, as scarcely a fit lesson even for grown children. But the Hebrew word *rakiya*, translated "firmament," is exactly equivalent to our *expanse* (given in the margin of the Revised Version), both meaning primarily something "beaten out," and then "space;" just as the word "space" originally meant something "drawn out." It might be asked how fowl were to fly in the open expanse of heaven if this expanse were the immense space in which the sun and moon are placed (Gen. i. 20); but here the Hebrew and the margin of the Revised Version again help us, for they tell us that the fowl were not to fly in the open firmament (a mistranslation), but *on the face of* the expanse—that is, in the atmosphere which was on the margin of the expanse. The second day's work was, therefore, the separation made between the fluid materials of which our earth was formed and the fluid materials of the other members of the solar system, by means of the expanse of space intervening between the heavenly bodies.

In the **Third Day** or **Age** of Creation, the dry land or earth and the seas became gradually separated; and "the earth vegetated vegetation, herb bearing seed, tree bearing fruit after his kind" (Gen. i. 12). Mr. Huxley objects that the description in our translation corresponds rather with later than with earlier forms of plant life, while the enormous vegetation of the coal formation is cryptogamic—that is, not flowering. Now, in the first place, the Hebrew word *dasha*, here translated *vegetate*, means to sprout, to be green, and the word *deshé* derived from it is more general than *grass*—it means any sprouts or vegetation (Sept. *botané*). Mr. Gladstone gets over Mr. Huxley's objection by supposing that the writer makes no distinction of

plants, but merely indicates the beginning of all plant life. But in the second place, some writers on geology have observed that though the plants of the coal formation are cryptogamic, or non-flowering plants, yet we have in them only the plants growing and deposited in the low grounds; that, in all probability, there were at the same time flowering plants growing on the higher grounds, of which all vestiges would have been washed away. Mr. Huxley makes another objection, namely, that the records of marine sea-life are vastly older than the traces left in the rocks of seed and fruit bearing plants; but, as we have said, the records of such plants may have perished; and, besides this, Genesis does not give us such details of early marine sea-life, but merely the barest, broadest characteristics of each age. There is nothing, as we shall see in the account of the fifth day's work, to indicate that "marine molluscs and crustacea, echinoderms, corals, foraminifera," and other animals of the palæozoic age, were not in existence in the third and fourth days. What *characterized* the third day of Moses was the separation of land and sea and an enormous vegetation, which we identify with that of the coal formation.

Fourth Day.—According to Professor Dana, the first triad of days sets forth the events connected with the inorganic history of our earth, beginning with the first detachment of light (or luminous bodies) and going on to the consummation of plant life. The second triad of days begins by exhibiting the same light power concentrated for our present purposes, when our earth ceased to be luminous, when its atmosphere got somewhat cleared, when the sun, once spread over a great part of the heaven, became consolidated, and when the luminaries thus became efficient for dividing day from day and year from year. When it is said that God made two great lights, the making may have extended from the beginning; but there must have been an age when the sun came to serve its present purposes: and this great stage of progress is the **Fourth Day** or **Age** of Genesis. We have only a very few verses to sum up the characteristics of the age, and cannot expect other details of the plant and animal life then going on.

In his account of the **Fifth Day** or **Age**, Moses gives us the broad outline or characteristic features of a well-marked age, which geologists have called *mezozoic*—that is, the age having animals intermediate between those of remote antiquity (*palæozoic*) and those similar to our present animals (*cainozoic*). Two or perhaps three mistranslations have here occasioned a hot contention between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Huxley. To begin with, Mr. Gladstone seems to contradict himself as to the sense to be attributed to "the waters" of the Mosaic Genesis. He has interpreted the word "waters" as meaning primordial matter in a welter-ing or fluid state; and then he gives us some Hebraist's assurance that in the Scriptures water never means anything else than water (*Good Words*, p. 306). We beg to refer him and his Hebraist authority to Isa. xlviii. 1, "Hear ye this, O house of Jacob, which . . . are come out of the waters of Judah;" or, as it is expressed in Ps. lxviii. 26, "Ye that are of the fountain of Israel." The word "waters" may thus express what Ovid calls "the seed of things." When, therefore, we read of "the waters" of the fifth day teeming with animal life, we may remember that land and water were still a good deal mingled; and the slimy mixture may have been the waters that teemed with an amphibian life. "And God said, Let the waters creep (or swarm) with swarms of animal life." The Hebrew word here is *sharats*, to "creep" or "swarm with" (Ger. *wimmeln;* Scotch, *wammel*); and its derivative *sherets*, here also used, is translated by Gesenius "reptiles," or "smaller aquatic animals." Mr. Gladstone should have observed how the Septuagint renders this expression: "Let the waters bring forth reptiles (ἑρπετά)." The Revised Version, like the Authorized Version, mistranslates the word "moving creature."

The account goes on: "And God created great *tanninim*." The Authorized Version renders this word by "whales;" and the Revised Version represents the *tanninim* as "sea-monsters." What are the animals really meant by *tanninim?* The word is doubtfully derived by Gesenius from a Semitic root, which he connects with the Greek τείνω, Latin *tendo*, to extend. It occurs again in Job vii. 12 ("Am I a sea or a *tannin*, that thou settest a watch over me," indicating an animal that could sally forth on land); and in Isa. xxvii. 1 ("In that day shall Jehovah with his hard and great and strong sword . . . slay the *tannin* in the sea"). Now, the sea of this passage in Isaiah may mean the river Euphrates, as "the sea" certainly does mean this river in Jer. li. 36. But it is more probable that Isaiah here means the Nile, as in Ezek. xxxii. 2. The *tannin* in the "sea" would thus be the crocodile. Again, the *tannin* was the animal into which the rod of Moses was turned, and this animal is also called a serpent (Heb. *nahash*, Exod. iv. 3, 7, 15). The serpent, however, is a reptile rather than a sea-monster. Compare Ps. xci. 13, where a poisonous reptile is meant. Finally, there are six passages (Jer. li. 34; Ezek. xxix. 3; Isa. li. 9; Isa. xxxii. 2; Ps. lxxiv. 3 and 4) where the word *tannin* undoubtedly means the crocodile of Egypt. Any one who takes the trouble to examine these passages will have no doubt that the great *tanninim*, of which Moses spoke, were great saurians, of which the crocodile was the type, and any one who has the least acquaintance with geology knows that the Triassic Rocks (that is, those of

the Upper New Red Sandstone, which come after the coal formation) are *characterized* by the footprints of great lizards (that is, saurians) and great winged creatures; and that the other secondary rocks above the Triassic, namely, the Lias and Oolite (the Jurassic), and the chalk, are characterized by remains of enormous saurians (that is, animals of the type of the crocodile) and winged creatures (the ichthyosaurus, plesiosaurus, deinosaurus, iguanodon, pterodactyl, and megalosaurus).

But the most extraordinary mistranslation is yet to come. The conclusion of the fifth day's work is, "And God created the great *tanninim* (which we might translate *saurians*) and every soul of life that creepeth (*haromeseth*), which the waters brought-forth-abundantly (*sharats*, the first verb) after their kinds, and every winged bird after its kind" (ver. 21). The word *haromeseth* here used is from *ramas*, and *ramas* means to creep or crawl and nothing else, while its derivative *remes* means only a reptile. Now, in describing the reptiles or creeping things of the sixth day (vers. 24, 25, 26), and the dominion given to man over creation, *ramas* and its derivations are the only words employed. Our translators, however, probably did not know or think of the early appearance of reptiles in the geological formations, and disregarding the Septuagint's consistent rendering (ἑρπετῶν), they have, from some fancy of their own, translated *ramas* by "move" in their account of the fifth day's work (ver. 21). So in ver. 20, they give us the wrong rendering "move" in the text, though the correct rendering "creep" in the margin. How then are we to explain this strange mistranslation and misrepresentation of the Mosaic account? We may imagine either that the translators, like Mr. Gladstone's Hebraist, fancied that "the waters" of the fifth day had ceased to be the sort of "waters" indicated in vers. 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, and thus thought, as Mr. Gladstone evidently thought, of "water population" or "fishes," and not of reptiles, which form the population of a slimy mixture of land and water, or water adjoining land. Or the translators perhaps imagined, as Mr. Huxley seems to think, that Moses proposed to give us a full account of the creation of all animals, and not the mere characteristics of every age. In the account of the sixth day's work, "in vers. 24, 25, 26," says Mr. Gladstone, "the creeping thing is distinguished from cattle, as if it (the reptile) were a formation wholly new." If the Mosaist really intended to convey that this was the first appearance of creeping things, there is, I suppose, no doubt that he is at war with the firmly established witness of science. If, however, the common rendering is to be maintained, it may be just worth while to suggest a possible explanation. His suggestion is that these reptiles are "a minor fact in creation" (*Good Words*, p. 311), that they were "skulkers fallen from greatness," and "introduced as a sort of appendage to mammals" on the sixth day (*Nineteenth Century*, Jan. 1886, p. 14). Mr. Huxley "marvels at the exactness of Mr. Gladstone's information as to the considerations which affected the method of the Mosaic writer;" but however "contemptible and even reprehensible" reptiles may be, Mr. Huxley considers that an account, which, according to Mr. Gladstone's translation, would place their first appearance in the wrong age, is not scientific. It is noteworthy that in summing up man's dominion over creation, the Septuagint reads: "Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of heaven, *and over the beasts and all the earth*, and over all the creepers (reptiles) that creep on the earth." The "beasts and all the earth" are not mentioned in the Masoretic text.

The account of the **Sixth Day** or cainozoic age of mammals could not be more scientifically given than in Genesis, and needs no comment.

The statement that God rested on the **Seventh Day** from all His work seems to Mr. Gladstone an extraordinary use of language; and certainly it needs more explanation than a reference to "its bearing on the great institution of a day of rest" (*Good Words*, p. 303). God never ceased working, as our Lord told the Jews when they persecuted Him for healing on the Sabbath (John v. 7). Another justification of the language of Genesis will be found in its right interpretation or translation. The primary idea of *Shabath* is to "sit down," to "sit still." The Hebrew word translated "end" in the Authorized Version and "finish" in the Revised Version is *Killah* (the piel of *Kalah*). Now this word means to "complete" or "make perfect," as in Gen. ii. 1 (the verse preceding our text), and in Gen. vi. 16. Also the preposition *min*, properly "from," may be rendered "after." Thus on the seventh day God completed His work which He had made, and He rested on the seventh day after all His work which He had made" (Gen. ii. 2). But how did God "rest" or "sit down"? "It behoves us to be adorned with works of righteousness along with our calling, that the Holy Spirit may rest (*requiescat*) upon us," said Irenæus (iv. 36); "for this is the wedding garment." In reference to these white robes, John is told that those arrayed in them are they who have come victoriously through the great tribulation, and that He who sitteth on the throne shall "tabernacle upon them" (Rev. vii. 15). There remaineth, therefore, this rest or Sabbatism for the people of God (Heb. iv. 9); for after God had made man, He completes or makes perfect His work on this seventh age, by Himself descending (sitting down) or tabernacling or resting upon man; in other words, by communicating Himself or His own Nature to men.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xi. 23–26.

"For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed took bread: and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come" (R.V).

Exposition.

These verses form probably the earliest record of the institution of the Eucharist, and they contain also the earliest recorded speech of our Lord. —*Stanley.*

"*I received of the Lord.*" Says Reuss, "Paul here speaks of a communication made to him by older disciples, but not of an immediate revelation." Then what means the "*I*" placed first in the sentence? If the Apostles as its channels conveyed this account to Paul, hundreds of evangelists could say the same, and St. Paul ought simply to have written, "*We* have received of the Lord."—*Godet.*

The manner in which the Lord communicated this fact to him, we know not, and can only refer to Gal. i. 11, 12.—*Godet.*

"*He was betrayed.*" The imperfect tense is used, intimating that the betrayal was not the result of sudden impulse, but the fulfilment of well-planned and now ripening counsels, known to Jesus when He was instituting the sacrament. The betrayal was the crisis in His history. It determined that He must die. Hence, the night in which this act was consummated was chosen by Christ for the institution of that sacrament which derives its meaning and virtue from His death.—*Edwards.*

"*When He had given thanks.*" The thanksgiving of the father of the family at the Paschal feast referred to the blessings of creation, and to those of the deliverance from Egypt. That of Jesus no doubt referred to the blessings of salvation, and the founding of the new covenant.—*Godet.*

"*This is my body.*" (1) "This" can refer to nothing else than the bread; (2) "is" can mean nothing, more or less, than "is," the particular nature of the identity depending upon the circumstances and the context. Now as the blessed body was there present, as yet unbroken, the "is" could not have been understood to refer to material identity—identity *quâ* substance, but it may, in part, have been understood then, and certainly is to be understood now, as implying a *real* sacramental identity, so that the faithful do verily and indeed receive the spiritual food of the broken body and poured out blood of the Lord; the bread and cup being "causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of His body and blood ensueth." (Hooker)—*Ellicott.*

"*Which is for you.*" This short but most comprehensive form of expression draws its full meaning from the word translated, "He brake it," above. It was "for you" by being broken (on the Cross), as the bread was symbolically broken in the sacrament.—*Ellicott.*

"*This do in remembrance of me.*" The words of Christ contain two distinct but connected ideas. The one implies His presence in the sacrament: "this is my body; this is my blood." The other implies His absence: "in remembrance of me." Both meet in the Apostle's word, "communion," which involves, first, that the communicant appropriates Christ; and second, that the instrument of this appropriation is conscious, voluntary faith. Appropriation of Christ necessitates His real presence; faith implies His equally real absence. The Apostle's teaching is inconsistent at once with the doctrine of transubstantiation and with zwinglianism.—*Edwards.*

"*In like manner also the cup, after supper.*" These words reappear literally in Luke's account. The two narratives prove that a certain interval separated the two acts of institution. The bread was distributed "while they were eating," as Matthew and Mark say, who thus positively express what is implied by the accounts of Luke and Paul. The words "after they had supped," in Paul and Luke, complete the view of what was done. The feast was therefore closed when the Lord took the cup.—*Godet.*

"*This cup is the new covenant in my blood.*" That is to say, according to Meyer and Hofmann, "This cup is, in virtue of the blood which it contains, the new covenant." But it is simpler to take "in my blood" as immediately governing the substantive "covenant." "The covenant in my blood," that is, the covenant concluded in my blood. —*Godet.* "The new covenant ratified by the shedding of my blood, and therefore *standing in* my blood, as its conditioning element."—*Alford.*

There is emphasis on the "*my*," with a tacit reference to the typical "blood of bulls and of goats."—*Evans.*

The term "new covenant" alludes to the covenant made at Sinai over the blood of the victim which Moses offered for all the people (Exod. xxiv. 8). This old covenant was recalled every year by the Paschal feast. But Jeremiah had already contrasted it with another (Jer. xxxi. 31-34).—*Godet.*

"*As oft as ye drink it.*" To refer this to every coming together at a social meeting, of which drinking formed a part (Hofmann), is a very unnecessary and improbable extension of the words. What the Apostle wishes to press is, that, whenever the common meal passed into the sacramental, the ordinances which He here gives were to be reverently observed.—*Ellicott.*

"*Proclaim.*" Not simply "shew forth" in act, but declare orally.—*Meyer.* "Ye declare,—solemnly announce as a subject of belief, an article of faith." Open and public celebration is implied.—*Webster and Wilkinson.*

The word occurs ten times in the Acts of the Apostles, always in the sense of proclaiming. We have here strong grounds for affirming that the *words of institution* formed part of the form of celebrating the sacrament, even in the apostolic times.—*Lias.*

"*Till He come.*" This clearly shows, not only that the observance of this ordinance was designed to continue from the very time of its first institution till the second appearing of the Lord Jesus, but that the belief of the one as the great *accomplished fact of the past*, and of the other as the great *expected fact of the future*, was—as the substance of all Christianity—proclaimed by every participant of the Lord's Supper, and the *faith* of the one and the *hope* of the other are the two "wings as eagles" on which the Christian mounts up heavenward.—*Brown.*

CRITICAL NOTES.

Παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου: "I received from the Lord." Three forms of expression were open to the Apostle: (1) παρέλαβον simply. He would then have left it undefined from whom or under what circumstances he received what he states. (2) παρέλαβον παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου (Gal. i. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1), in which case he would have specified distinctly that the communication came directly from the Lord. (3) The form he does use marks the *whence* of the communication, but in a wider and more general sense, and without necessarily implying direct personal communication. This is all that strictly grammatical considerations suggest. It is, however, scarcely doubtful (1) from the very insertion of the words under consideration, and (2) from the correlating καὶ, "also," in the clause that follows (ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα), that the Apostle distinctly sets forth our blessed Lord as the source from which the παράδοσις emanated which he here communicates.—*Ellicott.*

This question will be found discussed more or less fully in the commentaries of Meyer, Hodge, Edwards, Godet. See also *Expositor*, 2nd series, i. 433-437 (G. Matheson); Neander's *Planting of Christianity*, i. 94; Pfleiderer's *Hibbert Lecture*, p. 51; Crawford's *Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 29; Weiss' *Biblical Theology*, i. 468; Row's *Revelation and Modern Theology*, p. 111. See also on ἀπὸ and παρά, Ellicott's *Colossians*, note on iii. 24; and Lightfoot's *Galatians*, p. 80.

The *Textus Receptus* adds κλώμενον after τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. But the word is omitted in ℵ ABC, and Lachm., Tisch., Treg., West. and Hort omit. On the other hand, De Wette, Reiche, Hofmann, Wordsworth, Edwards retain. "My body, which is for you," is extremely bare; but is it not probable that this very bareness is that which occasioned the interpolation of the participle? It was so natural to borrow it from the preceding verb ἔκλασε.—*Godet.* There is a long note on the reading in Scrivener's *Introduction;* Westcott and Hort give the evidence in full, p. 116, app. See also Beet's *Corinthians*, p. 533.

"This do." To render the words "*sacrifice* this" in accordance with a Hebraistic use of ποιεῖν in this sense in the LXX. (Exod. xxix. 39; Lev. ix. 7, etc.), is to violate the regular use of ποιεῖν in the New Testament, and so import polemical considerations into words which do not in any degree involve or suggest them.—*Ellicott.* See the paper by Alfred Plummer in *The Expositor* for June 1888, vii. 441-449.

The forms of institution given respectively by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul will be found compared in Godet's *Corinthians*, ii. 156-160; Beet's *Corinthians*, p. 193; Stanley's *Corinthians*, p. 208; *The Expositor*, 2nd series, i. 439-443 (G. Matheson); Bleek's *Introduction*, i. 303; Stier's *Words of the Lord Jesus*, vii. 82; see also a paper on the omission from John's Gospel in the *Monthly Interpreter*, iii. 338-341 (H. R. Reynolds).

SUGGESTIONS FOR TREATMENT.

I.

The Lord's Supper.

By the Very Rev. J. J. S. Perowne, D.D.

This is the earliest account that we have of the institution of the Lord's Supper. St. Paul here tells us, first, that the account which he gives us is one he received directly by revelation from the Lord. Secondly, he recited the words of the institution, not differing very materially from those which we find in the Gospels. Thirdly, he gives us the meaning and explanation of the rite, "As often as ye eat," etc. Lastly, in the passage immediately following the text he warns the Corinthians against an unworthy participation of the elements.

There is one other passage in this Epistle in which St. Paul touches on the same subject (x. 14-22), from which we learn that in the one bread or one loaf used at the supper he saw a speaking type of the unity of the Christian Church.

These two passages contain the New Testament doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It is very simple. It is a proclaiming of Christ's death till He come; it is a reception of the body and blood of Christ; it is an act of Christian fellowship—and that is all.

It is a sacrament of Christ's *death*. It was His body *broken* and His blood *shed* which were given in it. We feed, not on the glorified risen Christ, but on Christ our passover, who was sacrificed for us.

The *place* it occupies in the New Testament is quite a modest one. In three of the Gospels we have its mere institution; in 1st Corinthians its institution and doctrinal significance—and that is all. We are now told it is a great and solemn sacrifice, yet the Epistle to the Hebrews, where, if anywhere, this should be found, is absolutely silent about it. We are told it is the means whereby our union with Christ is maintained, yet the Epistle to the Ephesians, which enters into the heights and depths of the spiritual life, makes no allusion to it. Nor do the pastoral epistles, though full of instructions on ministerial duties, say a word about the supper.

I do not mean to disparage this holy sacrament. It is a blessed means of grace, it may be the highest means; but it is only a means, and not the only means. The external act is not to eclipse the spiritual truth it signifies. It is not as a truth to be exaggerated at the expense of other truths and acts of worship. He who gives His most precious body and blood in that sacrament gives us all spiritual succour and refreshment whenever and wherever we draw near Him in faith.

II.

The Lord's Supper as a Commemorative Act.

By Edward Irving.

The chief aspects which the supper bears to the Church are these four:—First, as a great open commemoration and confession of Christ's death. Second, a solemn sacrament, or oath of fealty and service, into which we enter with the Lord. Third, an act of close communion, wherein the members of the Church do most charitably embrace and unite as one. Fourth, an act of thanksgiving, so singular in its kind, and exalted in its degree, as to have obtained for it in the primitive Church the common name of the Eucharist, or thanksgiving.

Let us in this discourse contemplate the Lord's Supper under the aspect of a commemorative act.

This view of the Lord's Supper grows out of its character as a *sign*, and has nothing to do with its high character as a seal and a pledge; and in these times, in which the base and heretical doctrine that the sacraments are but naked and bare signs, has obtained such alarming influence, this idea of mere commemoration has obtained a corresponding popularity. Commemoration is but a part of the whole service of the Lord's Table, though certainly no mean part.

Consider what it is that is commemorated. Go over, with due reverence, the account of the sufferings and death of Christ, from the time that the Greeks were brought to Him (when, as I conceive His passion began) till He was laid in the tomb.

Then reflect upon the reasons why He preferred to connect His memory with *this* ordinance. These reasons are, first, because it contains the great fact that He took unto Himself a body; and secondly, His great act of love in giving it for His Church.

But no memorial of Christ's death were faultless unless it contained also a memorial of His abiding and eternal life; for by His death He brought life and immortality to light. No grateful acknowledgments of His presence heretofore in a body upon this earth were sufficient, unless it contained the assurance that He was to be present in that body upon the earth again. Therefore adds the Apostle, "Ye do shew forth the Lord's death till He come." When He comes this ordinance shall cease from its present form; and yet the death of Christ shall ever remain the burden of eternal thanksgiving.

Thoughts and Illustrations.

As the element used in the sacrament of Baptism is the emblem of purity, and the action of washing or dipping therein is the sign of purification, so bread and wine, the elements used in the sacrament of the supper, are the emblems of strength and cheerfulness, and the action of eating and drinking is the sign of sustenance and nourishment. Bread is the staff of life, and wine cheereth the heart of man.—*Edward Irving.*

The word "is," over which there has been such violent controversy, was not employed at all in the language (Aramaic) which the Lord Himself used, but has been rightly inserted by the evangelists in accordance with the Greek idiom.—*Oosterzee; Dogmatics.*

"This do in remembrance of me." There is ineffable tenderness in this expression of Jesus. As Darby finely observes (in his little work on *Public Worship*), the expression "memory of me," twice repeated, makes the Holy Supper still more a memorial of our *Saviour* than of our *salvation*. Each time this feast is celebrated the assembly of the disciples of Jesus anew presses around His beloved person.—*Godet.*

We may think it more necessary to remember our sins; He calls us to remember His mercy who forgives them. We may think it more necessary to make good resolutions, and to consider how they are to be carried out; He tells us to remember His commandments. We may think it more necessary to dwell on our weakness; He would rather that we thought of His promises and His power. We may find it hard to think of anything but our sorrow; but, for an hour at least, He asks us to remember His love.—*R. W. Dale.*

Not, "This is my blood," but, "This is the new covenant in my blood." It was the practice of the ancient Arabs to

sign their treaties with blood drawn from their own veins. Even in modern times, when the Scottish peasants and nobles desired to express their adhesion to the Solemn League and Covenant, they, in some instances, wrote their names with their blood. There are also examples of conspirators binding themselves together by the practice of drinking a cup filled with human blood, as the most solemn mode of testifying their adhesion to each other. There is again the expression and the image familiar to all of us, of the soldier, the martyr, the patriot, shedding his blood for the good of his country, his cause, his religion. From the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias who was slain between the temple and the altar, from the blood of Zacharias to the last Turkish soldier who shed his blood under the walls of Plevna in behalf of the Sultan, it is the supreme offering which any human being can make to loyalty, to duty, to faith. And of all these examples of the sacrifice of life, of the shedding of blood, the most sacred, the most efficacious is that which was offered and shed on Calvary, because it was the offering made not for war or aggression, but for peace and reconciliation; not in hatred, but in love; not by a feeble, erring, ordinary mortal, but by Him who is by all of us acknowledged to be the Ideal of man and the Likeness of God. It is therefore this final and supreme test of our love and loyalty that the cup of the Eucharist suggests—our willingness, if so be, to sacrifice our own selves, to shed our own blood for what we believe to be right and true and for the good of others.—*A. P. Stanley; Nineteenth Century.*

"*Till He come.*" There are two feelings which belong to this supper—abasement and triumph; abasement, because everything that tells of Christ's sacrifice reminds us of human guilt; and triumph, because the idea of His coming again, "without sin unto salvation," is full of highest rapture. These two feelings are intended to go hand in hand through life, for that sadness which has not in it a sense of triumph is not Christian, but morbid; neither is that joy Christian which is without some sense of sorrow.—*F. W. Robertson.*

The Humour of our Lord.

PART I.

By the Rev. Alexander B. Grosart, D.D., LL.D., Blackburn, Lancashire.

I can very well conceive that on the first blush the heading of the present short Paper may startle and even "offend." I should not willingly or lightly incur the Master's "woe" by so offending the least or humblest fellow-Christian. It must be permitted me, therefore, in the outset, to safeguard myself from misunderstanding by two preliminary remarks:—

(*a*) *God and not the Evil One made humour.* So that in regard to it, I have been accustomed to answer objections much as I have done objections to Christians wearing jewels and gold and other adornments—viz. that God, by providing these, shows He meant them to be worn. Similarly, it is profoundly irreligious to discredit humour that by the Divine bestowment of it—on at once the loftiest and deepest natures of our kind—is demonstrated to have been intended to be used. Hence Sydney Smith's repartee to the pseudo-solemn clergyman who reprimanded him for the indulgence (as he phrased it) of his wit, was as devout as it was brilliant: "Now, sir, suppose—though I grant it to be a prodigious supposition in your case—Almighty God had given *you* wit instead of withholding it from you, what would *you* have done with it?" It *is* God's gift; and humour is the sublimation of wit.

(*b*) *The absence of humour in a recognised great man is held to be a defect.*—Take Shakespeare over-against such mighties as earlier Bacon and Milton, and later Wordsworth and Shelley. How does he tower "head and shoulders" taller than they? And why? Mainly through the presence—like an interpenetrative salt, or shall I say informing perfume?—of this subtle yet most human element, or quality, or faculty, or whatever it may be designated. Not only does Shakespeare by this supreme power win our personal love as "*gentle* Shakespeare,"—the almost invariable epithet applied to him by his contemporaries,—but by it he is differentiated from all other simply human intellects. By the combination of the most ultimate genius with the other, our "all-prevailing poet" stands out distinctively above all comparison. What were the deeps of ocean without the flash and play and iridescence of its foam?

This being so (*meo judicio*), it is to derogate from the humanness and the perfected greatness of our Lord to shrink from interrogating certain acts and utterances of His, in order to ascertain whether or no the "Man Christ Jesus" was not endowed with a quality that must be conceded as having been a characteristic of the largest, roomiest, and grandest of the sons of men, headed by Shakespeare (as we have seen), and followed by Cervantes, Sterne, Charles Lamb, Charles Dickens, Thackeray, Jean Paul Richter, *et hoc genus omne;* and, specially, by the foremost preachers of all time—*e.g.*, from Donne and Thomas Adams to Fuller and South, and modernly from Thomas Chalmers and Thomas Guthrie to Ward Beecher and Charles Spurgeon. In this connection, before passing forward, I fetch confirmation from a master's word-portraiture of perhaps the most John the Baptist-like minister of the gospel Scotland has ever seen—Dr. William Anderson, of Glasgow—as thus: "There was great power of pathos in him as well as of wrath, and he could make his hearers melt to tears as they had trembled with him in his anger. It became evident, indeed, as he passed to this side, that his indignation, in its fiercest vehemence, was compassion set on fire. *Like most men who draw love to themselves,*

he had a vein of very true and deep humour, which could rise in its turn to scathing sarcasm, and which expressed itself not less in the shifting light of eye and face" (Dr. John Ker, Introductory Sketch to *Regeneration*, 1875).

All this being so, I have not, for my own part, a shadow of hesitation in dealing with our subject. It may seem superfluous to affirm our uttermost reverence toward our Lord in this and every inquiry concerning Him. I seek to be excused by my earnest desire to take heed to the Apostle's monition, "Let us not therefore judge one another any more; but judge ye this rather, that no man put a stumbling-block in his brother's way, or an occasion of falling" (Rom. xiv. 13).

And now I know not that I can better put the matter than by going to *L'Antechrist* of Renan. Therein (p. 101) he describes the Book of *Ecclesiastes* as a "livre charmant, le seul livre aimable qui ait été composé par un Juif;" and adds (p. 102), "Nous ne comprenons pas le galant homme sans un peu de scepticisme; nous animons que l'homme vertueux dise de temps à autre, *Vertu, tu n'es qu'un mot.*" He goes on to say that the power of smiling at one's own work is "la qualité essentielle d'une personne distinguée," and maintains that this quality was strikingly exemplified in Christ.

The disappointment is that Renan contents himself with the enunciation of what he is too acute not to know could not fail to be regarded as a paradox, and so calling for full proof. The Hon. Lionel A. Tollemache is therefore justified, in his remarkable *Recollections of Pattison*, as reprinted from the *Journal of Education* of June 1885 in his *Stones of Stumbling* (1887), in his request, as follows:—

"I wish that some readers would inform me what saying or sayings of Christ Renan could possibly have had in his mind when he made this startling assertion (p. 183)."

Perhaps my Paper will go so far on the way of an answer, as perhaps also our introductory observations may modify the alleged "startling" characters of Renan's assertion. It is noteworthy that it should have proved "startling" to so bold and uncompromising an inquirer as the author of *Stones of Stumbling* and *Safe Studies*.

I propose to limit myself substantively, in the present Paper, to a single exemplification of the Humour of our Lord, touching on others merely. But I propose in a second Paper to demonstrate the presence of the same element of Humour throughout the Sayings and word-portraitures of our Lord. The example I mean is found in the Gospel of St. Matthew xi. 16–19, and St. Luke vii. 31–35. There are certain *nuances* and exquisite touches that evaporate in all translations, and therefore it is deemed expedient to give here the original:—

1. "Τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην; ὁμοία ἐστὶ παιδαρίοις ἐν ἀγοραῖς καθημένοις, καὶ προσφωνοῦσι τοῖς ἑταίροις αὐτῶν καὶ λέγουσιν, Ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε· ἐθρηνήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκόψασθε. Ἦλθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων· καὶ λέγουσι, Δαιμόνιον ἔχει. Ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων· καὶ λέγουσιν, Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

2. "Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος, Τίνι οὖν ὁμοιώσω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης; καὶ τίνι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι; Ὅμοιοί εἰσὶ παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις, καὶ λέγουσιν, Ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε· ἐθρηνήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύσατε. Ἐλήλυθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς μήτε ἄρτον ἐσθίων μήτε οἶνον πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Δαιμόνιον ἔχει· Ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. Καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς πάντων."

As we scrutinize these records, the HUMOUR of our Lord breaks out like rippling light over the page. Broadly regarded, how delicious is the taking-down of the listening Rabbis and other dignitaries of the synagogue (and not at all improbably of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem) by the likening them to a parcel of little children! For myself, having studied from the life such dignitaries-official (not all Jews or Mohammedans), I can easily picture to myself the bewildered amazement with which these "great ones" must have heard themselves thus compared with the children of the streets. Like the "common people" (so called), the Jewish functionaries-ecclesiastical held the "little ones" as beneath their notice; and even the Apostles, as we know, betrayed the same animus, and drew down upon themselves the passionate rebuke of the child-loving Redeemer, not without throbs of semi-indignation, semi-raillery. Therefore it could not fail to be *infra dignitatem* to these super-exalted representatives of official and perfunctory Judaism to have their conduct illustrated and reprimanded by the capricious changeableness of the children. I for one catch a look of the "foolish face of wonder" as they listened, much as when to-day one sees a stiff and starched and most ceremonious pomposity unceremoniously and familiarly spoken to.

But coming closer to the drastic exposure by our Lord of the dignitaries' reception or non-reception of Him and His gospel, the taking-down of these Rabbis, and others of like state and majesty and superiority (all most "superior" persons), must have been aggravated and acerbated by the things wherewith the children were occupied, viz. their mimic and mimetic games, or sports and pastimes. As at the present day all over the East, as I can testify, the children were used to get up mock-marriages and mock-funerals. They would contrive to array themselves as small bridegrooms and

brides, with entourage of attendants ; and similarly, by help of their dolls, would arrange a funeral, with tiny bier and other doleful paraphernalia. In both cases, they ended with abundant laughter and mirth. And the like of that was what these most reverend seignors were compelled to hear their attitudes toward John the Baptist and toward the Lord Jesus Christ characterized by respectively !

No one without a deep yet also sweetly tender sense of humour could or would have thought out such "wise fooling" (if I may dare so to name it). But this is not all. Over and above, *first*, the utter disregard of the "dignity" of these local dignitaries by placing them alongside of the children ; and *second*, the ludicrousness of game and pastime comparisons, there was the added element of TEMPER. The wording pulses with scorn and that "holy wrath" which like light condensing into lightning smote shatteringly ; but innerly there was undisguised contempt and derision. Yet was the contempt sheathed in humour, as I am claiming. Look at the way in which our Lord represents the conduct of these "dignitaries," as reflected by the children in their mimetic games of marriage and funeral, *e.g.* Masters Joseph and Isaac ask Masters Abraham and Moses to join them in a romp or mock-game of a marriage. "No ; they won't." Misses Rebecca and Sarah, Esther and Deborah, catching the repulse, come forward and propose a mock funeral. "No ; they won't." Masters Joseph and Isaac, and Misses Rebecca and Sarah, Esther and Deborah, wreathe arms and "pipe" with their small pipes, and dance their little dances, and ask, "Won't you join?" "No ; they won't." Something else is deftly contrived, and again the question is put, "Won't you join?" but with the same surly, sulky, unsocial, unloving reply, "No ; they won't." I intentionally represent the thing in a manner childishly ; for there lies the humour of it. Unless these Rabbis and associated dignitaries had no slightest touch or sense of humour, they could hardly fail to perceive how, under all the Lord's gravity, He was making fun of them and their stiff-and-starched standing on their hereditary authority and claim on reverence and obedience.

I do not enter upon any exegesis of this not very well understood or explained record. The more its real teaching is got at, the more will it be recognised that jets of humour dart here and there over the Master's words. That is *the* one point I seek to accentuate.

Other incidents in the life of our Lord, whilst He was amongst men,—as we shall see,—harmonize with my conception of this "taking down" of the "great ones"—this ridicule rooted in a sense of humour. I can only name other two in the present Paper :—

(*a*) *The message to Herod*, St. Luke xiii. 32 : "And Jesus said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox." . . . One should have liked to see the pinch-beck ruler's face, when that was told him ! Had the noble lion been the metaphor or even the prey-devouring wolf, he might have stomached it. But the humour and contemptuous disregard of him and all his power and evil-purpose of the comparison with the fox, must have been galling in the extreme. It is to be remembered that Tobiah barbed his keenest mockery of Nehemiah and his "wall" around Jerusalem restored, by the same comparison : "What do these feeble Jews ? Will they fortify themselves ? Will they sacrifice ? Will they make an end in a day ? Will they revive the stones out of the heaps of rubbish, seeing they are burned," said Sanballat ; and then followed Tobiah the Ammonite, "Even that which they build, if a fox go up, he shall break down their stone wall" (Neh. iv. 2, 3). Whether "fox" or "jackal," the message could not but be humiliating to Herod. Self-evidently here again our Lord, in Renan's phrasing, "smiled at His own words."

(*b*) *The rebuke of Simon's under-breeding*, St. Luke vii. 44–46. There was something deeper than humour here ; but humour there also was. Spoken in semi-public again, how must it have taken down the rich and patronizing Pharisee to have it flashed in upon him that the seeming-humble carpenter and peasant of Nazareth knew what a gentleman meant, and who was not a gentleman. And not only so, but it was inevitable that the "odious comparison," to her advantage with "the woman," would draw down on Simon alike the observation and laughter of all who heard. I cannot imagine that this was accidental. I must hold that our Lord enjoyed this putting to confusion of your "dignitaries." I therefore find in this, as in the others, evidence of the humour of Christ. To-day if one has anything of humour in his composition, he relishes deserved rebuke and monition that are spiced (so to say) with successful touches of the ludicrous, so as to take all the starch out of your ultra-dignified folks. Thus I take it was it with our Lord. He was too absolutely human not to value such flooring of spurious dignity.

I shall be glad if my little Paper and its sequel stimulate some others to look into this subordinate, but by no means unimportant, matter. He who has eyes to read between the lines, I think, will have small difficulty in finding a golden thread of humour running through the whole web and weft of our Lord's acting and speech. And as with THE MASTER, so with His noblest servant St. Paul. Unless I very much misjudge, he had a keen and scarcely repressible sense of humour, and of the ludicrous and even grotesque in men and things.

Will it be forgiven me, if parson-like, I counsel

that my fellow-servants of Christ would do well to unbend and cultivate, not repress, any faculty of humour they may possess? It needeth not that we talk the world's talk any more than that we go the world's ways to possess and utilize this divinely-bestowed gift. I am far from assuming that the one alternative to the Christian who can use humour is your grim, hard-featured, unrelaxing present-day Pharisee. I willingly concede that there are characters—characters of a blessed and hallowed likeness to their Lord—which overflow with a tender and winning love and lovableness, yet are seldom prompted to laughter. So be it. "There are diversities of operation, but the same Spirit." But none the less I must affirm that I am increasingly satisfied that your Christian who never laughs, and who shrinks from anything approaching wit or humour, weakens his influence, especially in intercourse with the young. On the other hand, I am equally satisfied that a whole-hearted, pleasant, gladsome Christian who can sanctify the faculty of humour as a God-given thing, to be used like any other "talent" for the Master, and not wrapped up in a napkin, adds to his influence in all that makes for righteousness. It would be an insult to distinguish the play of humour I advocate from "foolish jesting," and the "loud laugh that shows the vacant mind." Ethically, too, laughter is what God Almighty uses. "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against His anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. *He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh:* the Lord shall have them in derision" (Ps. ii. 2-4). This "laughter" and "derison" of Jehovah prepare us for the same in our Lord as He was "God manifest in the flesh." More than that, He who condemns laughter, derision, contempt (though not scorn), tacitly reflects upon God's own acting, and pronounces against God's own endowment of man with the faculties of laughter and humour. I am aware that a mediæval legend tells us that whilst Jesus wept He is nowhere represented as laughing. I traverse the statement. In a hundred places in the Gospels, actions are declarative of the face of the Lord having been radiant with smiles, and the voice attuned to pleasant laughter. Grace, therefore, will seek to sanctify and serve with humour and laughter, not to "charge God foolishly," by seeking to extirpate either. I close my Paper with all gravity. It is in my conception, I must reiterate, profoundly irreligious to frown upon the exercise of any faculty that has been bestowed upon us. If we possess it not, we must acquiesce; but do not let us challenge God, or challenge our fellow-creatures, to whom it is a joy to realize the humour of our Lord.

*** It ought, perhaps, to have been noted that whilst in the incident at Nazareth by ἀγορά is not necessarily to be understood the market-place, yet as simple matter of fact there the "market-place" is the open space where the children engage in their mimetic pastimes. I have watched them in various bazaars or Eastern marts—once off the street called "Straight," in Damascus, and often in Cairo, Constantinople, etc. Not far from the open space and market of Nazareth stands its ancient synagogue, with bevelled foundation stones, so that one felt that one's eyes were looking on the almost unchanged scene of our Lord's observation.

After the Exile.

After the Exile: A Hundred Years of Jewish History and Literature. Part II. The Coming of Ezra to the Samaritan Schism. By P. Hay Hunter, Minister of Yester. Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier, Edinburgh, 1890, 5s.

The period of Jewish history covered by this work is one with which many readers of Scripture have a small acquaintance and in which they take but a feeble interest. To all such we commend the study of the above volume. They will not meet with a dry page from beginning to end. The book sustains the reputation gained by Mr. Hunter in previous works of kindred aim. To the execution of his task the author brings a thorough grasp of the details of the situation, and his power of graphic description leaves nothing to be desired. The leaders of Israel move before us as real characters, men of like passions with ourselves, some of them indeed men of passion in more senses than one. Mr. Hunter does not discuss in much detail the thorny questions of the date and the relations to one another of the Deuteronomic legislation and the "Priestly Code," etc., although it is plain that he is at home in the literature of these questions. Many readers will probably welcome this giving them of results instead of processes, which secures a continuous narrative instead of one frequently interrupted by critical discussions. It may suffice to say that Mr. Hunter, while far from accepting traditional opinions, declines to receive the conclusions of extreme critics as to the liberties Ezra permitted himself in his redaction of the *Torah*. The Jewish legends about Ezra and the great synagogue are submitted to examination, and the volume closes with an estimate of the work of Ezra and his school in setting "a hedge" about Judaism, as well as unconsciously serving a *pædagogic* purpose with a view to the gospel of Christ.

J. A. Selbie.

The Sunday School.

The International Lessons for November.

I.

November 2.—Luke xxii. 54–71.

Jesus Accused.

The words of this sad lesson are mostly clear enough:

1. "The High Priest's house." Caiaphas was the High Priest, and it is his house that is meant by St. Luke. But his father-in-law, Annas, who had been High Priest previously, was sometimes called High Priest by courtesy, and it was into his presence, as we find from St. John, that Jesus was led first of all.

2. "A fire in the midst of the *hall*." The word means the open court in front of the house.

3. "Led Him into their council" (ver. 66). This council, or court of justice, was known by the name of the Sanhedrin. The High Priest presided, and its members were the elders, chief priests, and scribes.

4. "Ye say that I am." Jesus probably spoke in Hebrew (that is, in Aramaic), and in Hebrew these words are equivalent to a direct affirmative.

There are two separate subjects here: Jesus' three Jewish trials, and Peter's three denials.

It was in the early hours of the morning, between one and three, that Jesus received the traitor's over-acted kiss, and permitted Himself to be bound. He was led at once to the house of Annas. The only account we have of the trial before Annas is in St. John (xviii. 19–23). From Annas, who had no right to try Him at all, and who failed in his purpose of entrapping Him with His own words, Jesus was led to the house of Caiaphas, and before the assembled Sanhedrin. St. Matthew and St. Mark describe this second trial fully. St. Luke merely speaks of the violence done to Jesus in course of it (vers. 63–65). It occurred before it was day, and there is no doubt that Jesus was practically condemned to death before it was over. But it was unlawful to pass formal sentence of death during the night, and so another meeting of the Sanhedrin took place after daybreak. This is the meeting which St. Luke describes most fully. It is the third Jewish trial. Though the Sanhedrin was called this time merely to pass formal sentence, Caiaphas and the other members of it seem to have renewed their efforts to find something out of Jesus' own admissions whereof they might accuse Him to Pilate, in whose hands, as Roman governor, lay the power to put Jesus to death. *They* condemned Him for blasphemy, because He said He was the Son of God. But Pilate did not care for blasphemy. So they tried to get Jesus to say He was the Christ, for that word means "anointed," and it would be easy to make out that He claimed to be the *king* of the Jews. Their craft was outdone only by their cruelty.

While the rulers of the Jews were thus evilly entreating the Master, their servants were causing much trouble and shame to one of the disciples. The story is, alas, exceedingly human, and very pitiful. But notice the nearness of the divine to the human. It seemed to be all a chance that the cock crowed just when it did, but it was the Divine Master's appointed sign. It seemed to be another mere coincidence that just then Jesus was being led bound from the house of Annas to that of Caiaphas across the court. But the eye of infinite pity rested on Peter at the right moment, and the moment was divinely chosen. Now, notice a contrast. Peter "went out" into the night; Judas also had gone out into the night. Later on, Judas "repented" also. But there is a godly sorrow—Peter went out, and wept bitterly; and there is a sorrow of the world that worketh death—Judas repented, and went and hanged himself.

II.

November 9.—Luke xxiii. 1–12.

Jesus before Pilate and Herod.

The words and the references here are easily understood. We may notice:

1. "Thou sayest it." As in last lesson this is equivalent to an affirmative—"It is as thou sayest."

2. "Jewry"—that is, Judea.

3. "Herod . . . set Him at nought." Herod made sport of Him, and so fulfilled the prophecy: "He is *despised* and rejected of men" (Isa. liii. 3).

St. Luke makes a short story of the trial before Pilate, especially in this its first stage, but he alone tells of the trial by Herod.

The Jews brought three charges against Jesus, all of them carefully chosen to influence Pilate against Him. Two of them were literally false—that He perverted the nation, and that He forbade to give tribute to Cæsar. The third was true in the letter, but thereby the more treacherously false in the spirit—that He claimed to be Christ, a king. Pilate took up the last only. "Art thou the king of the Jews?" he asked. He must have put the question more in amusement than earnestness, as he scanned the harmless peasant who stood in chains before him. But the reply was firm and direct: "I am." Then came further questioning, as St. John informs us, and Pilate learned that the kingdom which He claimed was not of this world,—Cæsar and Jesus were not really rival monarchs,—and he went out to the chief priests and said, "I find no fault in this man."

They expected that. But Pilate can be moved by clamour and threat. They had learned this some time since. So "they were the more fierce;" and Pilate was glad to hear that Jesus was a Galilean. He would send Him to Herod, so relieving himself of an unpleasant task, and pleasing Herod at the same time.

"And when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad." A little later than this we are told, "Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord." The contrast is a striking one. But there is a striking contrast in Herod's own

history. It is said of the Baptist, "Herod heard John *gladly*, and did many things." John's words stirred his conscience to occasional victory, and so he was glad. Now a greater than John is here, and Herod is again glad, but it is only from vulgar curiosity—he hopes to see some miracle done by Him. Jesus is silent before Herod. What a lesson lies in that! With the ignorant Roman He conversed, to the many questions of the well-taught Hebrew He answers nothing. For Herod has thrown away exceptional opportunities, and now what is there, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment?

III.

November 16.—Luke xxiii. 13–25.

Jesus Condemned.

1. "Nothing worthy of death is done unto Him"—should be, "hath been done *by* Him." The Greek construction is the somewhat unusual one of a simple dative to mark the agent.

2. "For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast." The origin of this custom is unknown. The Gospels are the only authorities for it.

3. "Barabbas." *Bar* means "son," and *abbas*, "father;" hence "son of a (well-known) father." Perhaps his father was one of the Sanhedrin, which would explain their preference. If, moreover, he had led a popular insurrection against the Romans, he would be dear to the people's hearts. But, personally, he was both an insurgent and a murderer.

4. "Willing" (ver. 20)—that is, "wishing."

5. "They were instant with loud voices." They urged him or pressed upon him, literally "lay upon him" with loud voices.

Pilate had sent Jesus to Herod. Herod sent Him back to Pilate, and Pilate has to face the responsibility of either condemning or acquitting Him. What a cruel mockery have all these "trials" been! First Annas, next Caiaphas, and then the solemn Sanhedrin, fourthly Pilate, fifthly Herod, and finally Pilate again—Jesus is shot backwards and forwards amongst them, and injustice is put to shame in their treatment of that gentle sufferer who "openeth not His mouth." But this trial, the second by Pilate, is the most flagrantly unjust of them all. Three times Pilate declares the innocence of the accused. His final judgment is: "I can find no fault in this man." And yet he hands Him over to the soldiers for crucifixion.

Pilate's conduct as a responsible Roman magistrate is utterly indefensible. He is known to history, moreover, as weak, choleric, and cruel. Still, his position was a trying one. He was now no favourite at Rome; he had exasperated the Jews, and they had sent bitter complaints of his conduct to the emperor; another such complaint would probably cost him his office and his life. He was much to blame, God knows how much; but yet Jesus' own words to him were, "He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin."

The Jewish rulers, the deeper crime was theirs. It is terrible to notice their lynx-like watchfulness. Not a movement of Pilate's countenance escapes them. The moment he shows signs of releasing Jesus, they shout and threaten. From Pilate's judgment-seat they follow their victim to Herod's palace, and vehemently accuse Him there. They conduct Him back again, and soon the terrible cry is heard: "Crucify Him, Crucify Him!" They prefer a murderer to the Prince of Life. They accept the awful curse, self-inflicted, "His blood be on us and on our children."

Yet they also are included in Jesus' prayer: "Father, forgive them." "Great is their sin, but Thy pity is greater, O Lord," said St. Bernard.

IV.

November 23.—Luke xxiii. 33–47.

Jesus Crucified.

1. "Calvary." This is the Latin form of the Hebrew Golgotha; the Greek is Kranion. In all its forms the word means "a skull," and tradition says Calvary was a low round hill which got this name from its shape.

2. "Vinegar," the mixture of sour wine and water which the soldiers themselves drank.

3. "Malefactors." St. Luke uses this more general word. In St. Matthew and St. Mark they are called "thieves"—that is, robbers.

4. "Remember me when Thou comest into (rather *in*) Thy kingdom"—that is, when Thou comest as the King the inscription speaks of.

5. "Paradise," the place of the departed spirits of the blest, where they await the general resurrection.

"There they crucified Him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left."

Surely the centre cross is the source of interest here; and yet, so attractive is the incident of the penitent thief that we almost forget it *is* an incident and not the real subject of the lesson. So in the parable of the Prodigal Son, the beauty of the prodigal's history makes us forget sometimes that the real subject of the parable is the conduct of the elder son in contrast with that of the father. "I, if I be lifted up," said our Lord, "will draw all men unto me." And He is no sooner lifted up than one heart is drawn to Him irresistibly. Many have exercised themselves much in efforts to account for the robber's penitence. Was it Jesus' prayer, "Father, forgive them," that touched his heart? Dr. Farrar even thinks he may have heard Jesus preach while carrying on his trade of robber in some Galilean place to which Christ came. But these are only conjectures. We *can* no more account for it than for the thousand other instances that occur in daily life. Two men, whose lives have to all appearance been equally bad, now find themselves brought into closest touch with the Saviour of the world. One repents and is saved; the other hardens his heart and is condemned. It is the first of many like experiences which since then have been. And we do not know the explanation fully, we scarcely know it at all. But one thing we know, that if we are condemned, we are condemned justly, receiving the due reward of our deeds.

Further, the teacher may speak for a little upon these words of the rulers: "He saved others; let Him save Himself." Yes; why not?

Requests and Replies.

Will you kindly inform me what is the best popular book on Comparative Religion? Is Hardwick's *Christ and other Masters* of value?—J. D.

The request is for information on the best popular book on Comparative Religion (in English, I presume), and on the worth of Hardwick's *Christ and other Masters* in particular.

In reply, I should say that a popular book, thoroughly up to date, is still wanting. Hardwick is still a book of value, but requires to be both revised and supplemented. Other works of a popular order are Professor Moffat's *Comparative History of Religions* (New York), James Freeman Clarke's *Ten Great Religions*, Tiele's *Outlines of the History of Religion* (London, 1877), and Rawlinson's *Religions of the Ancient World.* A translation of Chantepie de la Saussaye's *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte:* that will be more like what is needed. Principal Fairbairn of Mansfield College, whose volume of *Studies in the Philosophy of History and Religion* is of great interest, is understood to have a book on the same subject in hand. —S. D. F. Salmond.

What are the various meanings attaching to the word "fool" in the Holy Scriptures? It appears to have at least *two* different meanings. This is plain in Prov. xxvi. 4, 5: "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou be like him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit." Obviously there must be *two* meanings of "fool" here, or these counsels would be amazingly contradictory. There is a third meaning of this word "fool," however, and it is used by our Lord Himself: "Whosoever shall say to his brother . . . Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire" (Matt. v. 22). The R.V., quoted here, gives the marginal rendering of "Thou fool," thus: "*Or, Moreh*, a Hebrew expression of condemnation." I understand this to mean something very bad and reprehensible; but *what?* Here I need light, for we very quickly read of the Lord Himself saying unto the Pharisees, "Ye fools and blind" (Matt. xxiii. 17), anent the temple and the gold. Here, then, is a meaning which is at variance with Matt. v. 22, or the Master Himself would be dangerously near to the danger He there speaks of. The rich man who bent his mind on massing wealth in the celebrated parable of our Lord (Luke xii. 20) is thus addressed by the Father Himself: "Thou fool" (A.V.), "Thou foolish one, this night thy soul is required of thee" (R.V.). Again, therefore, we have a meaning at variance with Matt. v. 22, or the Father Himself would not be exempted, and Christ would really be a blasphemer. And, lastly, St. Paul would come in condemnation also, for to the doubter of the Resurrection he says: "Thou foolish one" (R.V.); "Thou fool" (A.V.); "Senseless man" (Herbert); "that which thou thyself sowest is not quickened except it die" (1 Cor. xv. 36). Conybeare and Howson in their *St. Paul* render *Thou fool,* so that we have still another meaning at variance with Matt. v. 22. What, then, are the various meanings of this word rendered "fool?"—*A Young Baptist Layman.*

In Prov. xxvi. 4, 5, the word, of course, has the same meaning in both clauses; and the meaning refers to the different sides of the subject. If you answer a fool according to his folly, you run a great risk of being like him. If you do not answer a fool according to his folly, you run the risk of bolstering him up in his self-conceit, as if no reply could be given to him.

In Matt. v. 22, the admonition is against unrighteous anger; you are not to upbraid men or unjustly attack their character. You are to beware of everything approaching to a harsh and uncharitable disposition. Μωρέ is Syriac, denoting fool in a moral sense—that is, a wicked, impious person, equivalent to the Hebrew "Nabal." Of course it is not intended to prevent us expressing our opinion concerning foolish actions, as when we say "that man acts as a fool"; it is harsh and uncharitable judgment that is here condemned. Our Lord in calling the Pharisees "fools and blind," only expressed the feelings of righteous indignation. When in the parable God is represented as saying to the rich man, "Thou fool, this night thy soul is required of thee," it is an expression of the extreme foolishness of his conduct in preferring earthly riches to heavenly happiness.—P. J. Gloag.

In reading the works of writers on the New Testament, I am frequently impelled to ask myself how much weight ought reasonably to be given to the exact meaning of the words used. Who would think of minutely examining the words used even by our best writers, and asserting that they had in their mind, when penning every word, its exact etymological meaning or signification? Still less should we think of examining the words of a historian in the same minute way. Now it appears to me that whilst it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that our Lord spoke with the utmost precision, it is *not* reasonable to suppose that the Evangelists remembered His *exact* words. They might retain the general meaning or drift of His words; but as we cannot admit that simple, unlettered men would feel the full force of each *word,* it is difficult to believe that they did not frequently in their "memorials" use words which

seemed *to them* to express the same thing, the same general idea, but which as a matter of fact did not. Moreover, the critical method in question does not stop at Christ's own words, but analyses the words used by the Evangelists in pure narrative. May I ask for a reply in an early issue of *The Expository Times*?—E. S.

(1) It is highly probable that our Lord spoke in Aramaic, and it is not only probable, but well attested by early writers, that St. Peter's and St. Matthew's recollections of what He said and did were originally composed in Aramaic also. When, therefore, St. Mark translated St. Peter's Memoirs from the Aramaic into Greek, a considerable sacrifice of precision must have been made. Yet in God's good providence the Aramaic original has been lost, the Greek version has been preserved, to teach us not to put our trust in the letter of Scripture, but in Him of whom it testifies.

(2) If both the Aramaic and the Greek editions of St. Peter's Memoirs were preserved in oral tradition for upwards of thirty years before they were committed to writing, a further loss in precision was, humanly speaking, inevitable. That such a loss really took place is shown by the verbal discrepancies which exist in those parts of the written Gospels which are common to three or two Evangelists.

(3) These considerations show that verbal precision is not absolutely necessary to a divine revelation. Neither is grammatical or philological precision. The Apostles were not classical scholars; they had not been trained in the rabbinical schools (Acts iv. 13). God chose the foolish things of the world to confound the wise (1 Cor. i. 27). The Evangelists sometimes, as in the case of the word "transfigured," employ a term which does not express what was their evident meaning. St. Luke, writing for Gentiles, carefully avoids the word.

Yet, if I may use an illustration without irreverence, the instance of John Bunyan shows that an unlettered man, may under certain conditions produce work of far higher literary merit and intrinsic worth than was produced by his educated contemporaries. And in the case of Apostles, personal intercourse with Christ, and the divine inspiration of the Holy Spirit, enabled them to write as never men wrote. And though we cannot insist on the correctness of every word which they employed, but must use common sense and the context in arriving at their meaning, still they were very far from being careless or inaccurate thinkers. The gospel sections, moreover, were moulded during oral transmission to express the faith and suit the need of Churches. And minute investigation into their meaning, if wisely and sympathetically applied, will, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, reap a rich harvest.—ARTHUR WRIGHT.

In 1 Corinthians x. 9, we read: "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents." Does this mean that Christ was tempted by the Israelites in their journey through the wilderness?—A.

There is an important variant in the original text which indicates that this question suggested itself at a very early age. For instead of τὸν χριστόν,—the reading of the Received Text, on which the Authorized Version is founded,—the most ancient manuscripts of the New Testament read τὸν κύριον. The Codex Alexandrinus has τὸν θεόν: but this reading, however venerable its authority, may be rejected without hesitation; for it is evidently a correction introduced by the copyist with a view to the harmonizing of the passage with current phraseology. The reading of the Received Text, τὸν χριστόν, though resting on inconsiderable manuscript authority, is not without critical support. It is difficult, for instance, to understand how τὸν χριστόν could be substituted of set purpose for τὸν κύριον, which is a much simpler reading; whereas one can readily understand the substitution of τὸν κύριον for τὸν χριστόν. A copyist might very naturally, and without conscious intention, follow in the track of our Lord's words in the scene of the Temptation: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord, τὸν κύριον, thy God." Yet, notwithstanding the force of subjective considerations, and the authority of such eminent scholars as De Wette, Billroth, Osiander, Stanley, and others, it is impossible to evade the conclusion that the preponderating evidence is in favour of τὸν κύριον. Even Meyer,—a very purist in his fidelity to the Received Text—is constrained to regard τὸν χριστόν not as an original reading, but as an interpretation. We must, therefore, render the passage according to the Revised Version: "Neither let us tempt the Lord, as some of them tempted," etc.

This being assumed, the question arises, To whom does the Apostle refer in his use of this term? If we turn to the Old Testament record of the event cited by St. Paul, we read: "And the people spake against God (Elohim), and against Moses, Wherefore have ye brought us up out of Egypt to die in the wilderness? . . . And the Lord (Jehovah) sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died" (Num. xxi. 5, 6). The name Jehovah is used throughout the record, save in the first clause above quoted. In the 78th Psalm, vers. 18, 19, where reference is made to this incident, we read: "And they tempted God in their heart. . . . Yea, they spake against God, they said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness?" The name applied to the Divine Being throughout the entire Psalm, with but two exceptions, is El, or Elohim. It is clear, therefore, that the history itself does

not shed much light on the interpretation of τὸν κύριον in the passage before us.

If, however, we turn to the chapter which suggests the question at issue, we meet with a solution, which, if not complete, is less hampered by difficulty than any other that has been proposed. In the Revised Version, the chapter opens thus: "For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant, how that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them; and the rock was Christ." It is true that the Apostle immediately adds: "Howbeit with most of them God was not well pleased," a parenthesis which perhaps forbids a dogmatic interpretation of the τὸν κύριον of ver. 9. But it is evident that St. Paul did not hesitate to believe and teach that the Eternal Word, though as yet unrevealed and non-incarnate, was ever present in the Church of the wilderness; and that manifestations of His spiritual and wonder-working power were vouchsafed to His people for their guidance and help. "From this and other passages," says Bishop Wordsworth, "the Fathers inferred that the Eternal Son of God revealed Himself before His incarnation . . . to the Patriarchs, and administered the affairs of the Old Dispensation."

The belief of the Church that the Son of God, not as yet incarnate, was "ever moving in the midst of Israel," is frequently and fully recognised in the New Testament. St. Peter, in his first Epistle, chap. i. 10, 11, speaks of the Spirit of Christ as having inspired the ancient prophets, and "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them. According to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 26), Moses esteemed "the reproach of Christ" as "greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." In the same direction is the teaching of Jude, who in the sixth verse of his Epistle reminds his readers that "the Lord (ὁ κύριος) having saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not." This passage is the more interesting and significant from the fact that two of the most ancient manuscripts read, instead of ὁ κύριος, ὁ Ἰησοῦς,—a reading which Stier characterizes as "without example, and incomparably strange"; but which Lachmann adopts, and which Tregelles and Westcott and Hort regard with so much favour as to give it a place in the margin. One of the correctors of the Codex C reads ὁ θεός. Whatever the value of these variants may be, they indicate that there was a strong opinion in the early Christian Church as to the relation of the Eternal Word to the Church in the wilderness.

In view of these facts, and of the well-known usage of the New Testament to refer the term ὁ κύριος to Christ in every case in which it does not stand in a quotation from the Old Testament, it seems reasonable to assume that in this passage St. Paul represents our Lord as the Divine Being who accompanied His people in their memorable journey, and who so often appears under the Old Dispensation as "the Angel of the Lord," who, moreover, is spoken of by Isaiah as "the Angel of His Presence" (lxiii. 9); and in the last of the prophets, as "the Angel of the Covenant" (Mal. iii. 1). And it would seem as though the special reason which induced the Apostle to make this reference was, that he might emphasize the fact that in the abuse of their liberty the Corinthian Christians were sinning against, and thus tempting, their Lord and Saviour, who loved them, and gave Himself for them, even as their forefathers had tempted Him.
—Robert N. Young.

The Life of Abraham.

Bible Class Primers: The Life of Abraham. By C. Anderson Scott, B.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 6d.

This latest addition to the excellent series of Bible Class Primers issued under the editorship of Prof. Salmond is in every way worthy of its predecessors. It is an admirable example at once of compression and clearness. The facts of the Patriarch's life are related with a fulness and precision of arrangement that leave nothing to be desired. After a careful examination, I have found nothing of any essential moment omitted, while the relative importance of the successive incidents is duly taken into account in the treatment they receive. But the book is much more than a mere condensed narrative of Abraham's life. The place of the Patriarch in the divine history of redemption, the meaning and purpose of the successive promises he received, the elements which went to form his faith, and its effects as manifested in his relations to God and men, his character as gradually formed under divine training, and his high standing as "the father of all them that believe," and "the Friend of God,"—all these varied topics are treated with a keenness of insight and a lucid simplicity of statement which make the work, though so unpretending in form, an expository treatise of no mean value. The outward conditions of life in the midst of which Abraham was placed,—first in his early Chaldean home, and afterwards as a stranger in the land of promise, surrounded by heathen tribes,—are made sufficiently vivid to give a satisfactory background to the picture.

R. Masson Boyd.

Exposition of the First Epistle of St. John.

By Professor Richard Rothe, D.D.

CHAPTER II. 6, 7.

"He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also to walk even as He walked. Beloved, no new commandment write I unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning: the old commandment is the word which ye [have] heard [from the beginning]."

Ver. 6. John has shown in vers. 3–5 how, without the keeping of the commandments of Jesus, fellowship with Him, belonging to Him, is a psychological impossibility. He now adds that for the man, who asserts that he stands in fellowship with Him, this keeping of His commandments is a moral *duty:* "he must do so, he is bound to do so." To walk as Christ walked is the same as the conscientious keeping of His commandments. From the fact that Christ is in the Christian and the Christian in Christ, from the fellowship of being on the part of the believer with Christ, there follows, by a natural necessity, the fellowship of both also in respect of their way of acting, the sameness of the walk of both.

As regards fellowship with the Saviour, the Apostle definitely distinguishes between an abiding in Him and a merely coming into contact with Him. This is an earnest warning to us, so far as our intercourse with the Saviour still lacks continuity. We may have very vivid impressions of Christ, yea, we may be strongly laid hold of by Him at moments, and yet there may still be no abiding in Him. The individual manifestations of His nearness will attract our attention all the more forcibly, from the very fact of their being individual and isolated. But this may lead to a very dangerous delusion. It is one of the best signs of the reality of our Christian state, when we have little to tell of extraordinary manifestations of our Saviour's nearness, because we are continually in His company. The special festivals in our spiritual life cease, because the working days themselves become festivals. The more we are still conscious of needing to be transported into Christian moods, so much the less is our new Christian nature advanced. The quieter and more uniform it is, so much the more advanced is it. The less it seems to us something special, and the more our life as Christians and as men perfectly coincides; the more we realize that, in order to be men, we must be Christians, and conversely, so much the more surely have we reached the state of abiding in Christ. He who thus abides in Him is really in Him. The sameness of being must have also a sameness of walk as its consequence; and it is an inner impossibility that one that belongs to Christ should be able to walk otherwise than He. When the world lays an uncommon stress upon this test, it has full right to do so; and in this criterion there is involved a great honour to Christians. Of an idle fellowship with Christ, which should be merely a fellowship of heart and not at the same time also a fellowship in outward deed, the Apostle knows nothing, notwithstanding the fact that he does not know of a fellowship with Christ in action that is not based upon fellowship with Him in heart. We are not to yield to the bias to turn predominantly to the subjective side—this is a thought specially significant in John.

Ver. 7. John still owes his readers information as to the specific commandments of Christ, and as to wherein the uniqueness of the Saviour's walk consisted; and this information he now gives them. He does so, however, in such a way, that he remarks that there is really no need of such instruction, seeing the commandment, of which he speaks, is one that is old and well-known to them for a long time, so that even without any express mention of it they must at once have naturally understood him. Nor does he proceed straightway to mention it, but only describes it in its wonderful uniqueness by laying stress upon the fact that it is at once the absolutely old commandment and the new. This definite commandment, however, of which John has been thinking also in vers. 3–6, is that of *brotherly love.* Expositors in all ages, and even those who have done so reluctantly, have felt compelled to adopt this view. So also in iii. 11, and in 2 John 5. In the passage before us, we cannot but see also an express allusion to John xiii. 34, and xv. 12; but that which is decisive for the interpretation we have adopted is the circumstance, that in vers. 9–11 brotherly love is set forth as that which is characteristic of the Christian walk in the light.

The expression "*which ye had from the beginning*" refers to the time previous to the conversion of the readers to Christianity, when they already had the commandment of brotherly love, and that, too, not merely those of them who had formerly been Jews, in the Old Testament law (Lev. xix. 18), but also those of them who had formerly been Gentiles, in the law of nature. It does not refer to the time since their conversion; for when the commandment of brotherly love is described in ver. 8 as a new commandment in consequence of the appearing of the Saviour, it can be called an old one here (in ver. 7) only as being a command-

ment which, prior to and apart from His appearing, was already extant for men. On the other hand (as in ver. 24), the *word, which they have heard from the beginning*, is certainly that which they have heard as the commandment of Christ from the beginning of their acquaintance with the gospel. John looks upon this commandment of brotherly love as the real principal content of the whole gospel message—so far, at least, as it is a practical message. This natural law of brotherly love, he says, is that which ye have heard as the commandment of Christ since the beginning of your acquaintance with the gospel; this and nothing else. Ye know, therefore, of yourselves what I mean, when I speak of the "commandment of Christ."

According to this, the commandment of brotherly love has been given to men at large from the beginning of the human race, and in a certain measure they have also been conscious of it. It is an essential feature of the characteristic Christian frame of mind, that the Christian is conscious of the will of his Saviour as a will that does not at all impose new demands that were not already of themselves involved in the nature of the human race. They are rather purely and universally human demands, which the Saviour addresses to us; but they are none the less on that account demands which He first actually makes. He first brings them into man's full, clear consciousness, and puts them in such a way that man becomes aware of their inevitable obligatoriness for him. Thus the Saviour first, so far as we are concerned, draws forth the half-buried primal, divine commandment into the full daylight of our consciousness. What we as men really are becomes manifest to us, first of all, in and through Him. The Christian is only man; but he is man as only the Christian knows him. The Christian must, therefore, with the most unconditional consent of his inmost nature, decide with respect to the Lord, that He only demands that which a man worthy of himself must absolutely demand of himself. Upon this, also, rests to some extent the Christian's assurance of the coming, perfect universality of faith in Christ. Because the Saviour brings nothing else than what belongs essentially to man as such, He must be able to find acceptance with all men; and because no other than He can perfectly communicate what belongs to the true nature of man, all must ultimately come to Him, in order to obtain it from Him. The Christian, however, should be all the more heedful that nothing is mixed up with Christianity, that is not in itself necessarily human, and that Christianity is not robbed of this its truly divine universalism by ordinances of man.

The Dispensation of the Spirit.

By the Rev. John Porteous, M.A., B.D.

If there were saints of the Old Testament, they must have been sanctified, and that by the Spirit. Wherein, then, consists the pre-eminence of the New Testament Dispensation as regards the outpouring of the Spirit? (Matt. iii. 11; John vii. 39, xvi. 7).

The answer is: On the basis of the new Dispensation there is vastly wider scope for the action of the Spirit than there could be on the basis of the old.

1. The tacit assumption of the Law was that a man might sanctify himself. Experience was to show the fallacy of this. The Holy Spirit was not promised, though He would not be withheld from those who realized their helplessness and sought Divine aid (Ps. li. 11; cxliii. 10). On the other hand, the gospel, starting with the proclamation of human helplessness, had, as its very design, the outpouring of the Spirit. Thus the operations of the Spirit under the New Testament greatly exceed anything known before. Ours is the missionary epoch.

2. The Spirit is the Spirit of truth (John xiv. 17). In His action on the soul, He keeps pace with the revelation of truth (so cf. 1 Pet. i. 23, and John iii. 5). His work is to take of the things of Christ and show them unto us (John xvi. 13–15). In so far, then, as the revelation of truth is narrowed (as, *e.g.*, under the Old Testament), the action of the Spirit is narrowed. The less distinctly and completely the things of Christ are within human cognition (as, *e.g.*, before Christ came), the less full can be the work of the Spirit. There is a Christian "full assurance," "peace," "joy," "hope," "love," "fellowship," "character," which can be produced only on the basis of Christian facts and principles. The production of these constitutes the special outpouring of the Spirit in Christian times.

For the Study of the Bible.

II.

The Christian Women's Education Union.

This Society has made remarkable progress in Scotland since its establishment eight years ago, under the presidency first of the Countess of Aberdeen, and latterly of Lady Victoria Campbell. Its main object is to promote among educated women, especially among those who have recently left

school, the combination of the pursuit of the higher branches of secular education with the thorough and devotional study of the Scriptures.

Special prominence was given, at the annual meeting in Perth in September, to a new development of the movement. A branch was formed a year ago, under the name of the "Scottish Women's Bible Study Association," with a view to "the definite, devotional, and systematic study of the Scriptures."

No doctrinal test is required of *members;* but no one is admitted to the Council of the Association, or to a place among its leaders, who does not profess belief in the articles of the Apostles' Creed, and in "the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible, as the supreme rule of faith and life." A course of Bible study is prescribed for each winter; books are recommended in connection with it, and examinations (optional) held in spring.

For last winter the papers were on the Book of Exodus, by Rev. J. H. Skrine, warder of Trinity College, Glenalmond; and on the first half of the Gospel according to St. John, by Rev. James Robertson, D.D., Whittinghame. For session 1890-91 the papers are on the Book of Job, by Dean Montgomery, Edinburgh; and on the second half of the Fourth Gospel, including the question of its authorship, by the Rev. Dr. Robertson of Whittinghame. These papers may be had on application (enclosing stamped envelope) to the General Secretary, Mrs. Bannerman, 1 King's Place, Perth. M. H. B.

At the Literary Table.

Some of the leading publishers have sent us lists of their forthcoming books, from which we make the following attractive selection:—

Body: *School of Calvary* (Longmans).

Bright: *Lessons from Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Augustine* (Longmans).

Curtiss: *Biography of Delitzsch* (T. & T. Clark).

Delitzsch: *Isaiah*, vol. ii., latest edition (T. & T. Clark).

,, *Messianic Prophecies* (T. & T. Clark).

Douglas: *Minor Prophets* (T. & T. Clark).

Driver: *Literature of the Old Testament* (T. & T. Clark).

Findlay: *Thessalonians* (Camb. Bible for Colleges).

Gwilliam: *Peshito Version of Gospels* (Clar. Press).

Hall, Newman: *Gethsemane* (T. & T. Clark).

Hatch: *Concordance to Septuagint* (Clar. Press).

Humphreys: *Timothy and Titus* (Camb. Bible for Colleges).

Jebb: *Erasmus*, The Rede Lecture (Camb. Univ. Press).

Kirkpatrick: *Psalms*, vol. i. (Camb. Bible for Colleges).

Newman: *Letters and Correspondence* (Longmans).

Paget: *Sermons* (Longmans).

Payne-Smith: *Thesaurus Syriacus* (Clar. Press).

Perowne: *Galatians* (Camb. Bible for Colleges).

Riehm: *Messianic Prophecy*, new edition (T. & T. Clark).

Ryle and James: *Psalms of Solomon* (Camb. Univ. Press).

Schürer: *Jewish People in Time of Christ*, div. i. vol. ii. (T. & T. Clark).

Simcox: *Revelation* (Camb. Bible for Colleges).

Stirling, Dr. Hutchison: *Philosophy and Theology*, The Gifford Lectures (T. & T. Clark).

Studia Biblica, vol. iii. (Clar. Press).

Swete: *Septuagint*, vol. ii. (Camb. Univ. Press).

Watts: *New Apologetic* (T. & T. Clark).

Wordsworth: *Novum Testamentum Secundum editionem S. Hieronymi* (Clar. Press).

Wright, Dr. W.: *Comp. Gram. of Semitic Languages* (Camb. Univ. Press).

Dr. Hutchison Stirling's Gifford Lectures (*Philosophy and Theology*, being the first Edinburgh University Gifford Lectures. By James Hutchison Stirling, LL.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 9s.) has just been received, much too late for adequate notice this month. But having opened the book by the merest chance at p. 120, we fell upon a passage which has so close a bearing upon the note in our October issue upon Dr. Stirling and Carlyle, that we shall give it here.

Carlyle and Goethe.

Speculating on the relation between two men, in many respects so unlike each other, I had, in my own mind, referred the source of it to that part of *Wilhelm Meister's Travels*, where one of the Heads of an Educational Institute, conducting Wilhelm from hall to hall, prelects equably on the various religions. To read this was a new experience to Carlyle. As his early letters tell us, the perusal of Gibbon had won him over to the side of heresy; and any further progression in the same direction could only exhibit to him Christianity—in Hume, Voltaire, and the Encyclopædists, say—as an object, not of derision merely, but even of the fiercest hatred and the most virulent abuse. This, then, as on the part of these Germans, was a novel experience to Carlyle—the dispassionate, open-eyed, significant wisdom of such tolerant and temperate discourse even in respect of the Christian religion; and it was as with the light and the joy of a new revelation that he returned, *at least to all the feeling and the reverence and the awe*, that had been *his* in his boyhood under the eye of his father. And so it was that the first aim of Carlyle, as in the *Sartor Resartus*, was the re-establishment in every earnest, educated, but doubting soul, of the vital reality of true religion. In that work, to such souls wandering in the dark, the light of Carlyle suddenly strook through the black of night as with the coming of a celestial messenger. "It is the night of the world," they heard, "and still long till it be day: we wander amid the glimmer of smoking ruins, and the sun and the stars of heaven are as blotted out for a season; and two immeasurable phantoms, Hypocrisy and Atheism, with the ghoul Sensuality, stalk abroad over the earth, and call it theirs: well at ease are the sleepers for

whom existence is a shallow dream. But what of the awe-struck wakeful?" And thenceforward, after this book of Carlyle's, it was in the power of anyone who, at least, *would* awake, to lay himself down in the very heart of that awful "Natural Supernaturalism," to see, to wonder and to worship; while those mysterious "organic filaments" span themselves anew, not in vain for him. That was the *first* mood of Carlyle; and it was his *highest*. He never returned to it. His *Hero-Worship* contains, perhaps, what *feels* nearest to it; and it is significant that Carlyle himself made a common volume of the two works. But history and biography occupy him henceforth; and in these, unfortunately, so much of the early Gibbonian influence, to call it so, crops out, that Carlyle, on the whole, despite his natural, traditional, and philosophical piety, passes through life for a doubter merely, and is claimed and *beset* by the very men whose vein of shallow but exultant Aufklärung is precisely the object of his sincerest reprobation and uttermost disgust. There is a good deal to confirm as much as this, in his address as Rector here of this University, especially in his reference to "ten pages, which he would rather have written than all the books that have appeared since he came into the world." These ten pages contain what I have referred to in connection with Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister;* and I was well content to hear from Carlyle's lips on that occasion that I had not speculated badly as to the source of his veneration for a man who, if a prophet to him, might prove, on a closer inspection, perhaps, for all his dispassionate words on religion, somewhat of the earth earthy to us.

The Scots Magazine for October opens with an article by the Rev. D. Macmillan, M.A., on "Recent Religious Novels and the Moral Theory of Another Life." Two recent "religious" novels are discussed—*John Ward* and *The Story of an African Farm*. The former is of slight literary value, owing its popularity to the interest of the religious topic it handles. The latter is of greater power and interest. Both are revolts against popular religious conceptions—popular misconceptions, Mr. Macmillan holds—the former, regarding the future state of the wicked; the latter, the future state of the good.

To *John Ward* Mr. Macmillan replies that Christ does *not* assign men to future punishment upon a mere question of dogma, but in harmony with "the moral instinct of humanity. Indeed it is the intensely human grounds of His judgment that make us feel its final nature. If we 'did it not to one of the least of these,' we carry our judgment in our own breasts." *An African Farm* rejects the popular conception of heaven where each individual is perfect, and where there is therefore no room for mutual sympathy and help. Mr. Macmillan's reply is that that is not the heaven of the New Testament. As the Christian life is one of mutual benefaction here, so it will be, he believes, hereafter. "We enter heaven with our aspirations, and also with our imperfections; and my brother's wants will be supplied from my fulness, and my deficiencies will call into action my brother's gifts."

The *Spectator* of 4th October gives the first place among its reviews to Miss Lane's **Life of Vinet** (*The Life and Writings of Alexander Vinet*, by Laura M. Lane. With an Introduction by the Ven. F. W. Farrar, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890, 7s. 6d.) It is a most readable, fresh, invigorating book. We should say this only, by way of criticism, that there would have been no harm had the author relied less upon her authorities and more upon her own capable judgment and vivid pen. But the main thing is that we have here a pleasant portrait of an open-minded and most lovable Christian scholar.

Dr. Parkhurst is well known to be an accomplished scholar as well as an eloquent preacher. A volume of sermons just issued (**The Blind Man's Creed**, and other sermons, by Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D., pastor of the Madison Square Church, New York. London: R. D. Dickinson, 1890) will not hurt his reputation in either respect. A typical sermon is the thirteenth, of which the text is: "He must increase, but I must decrease"—John iii. 30; and the title: "Man's Unconscious Immortality." The following paragraph will give an idea of its thought and language.

Foresight and Insight.

"I must decrease." It has been conjectured that John in saying this had a presentiment of his martyrdom, so soon to be accomplished across the river in the fortress of Machærus. That is indeed possible. And yet, certainly, it is not so fine an accomplishment to be able to foresee what is going to happen as to be able to feel what in the very nature of things must happen. Insight is better than foresight. It would not be so great an achievement, for instance, to have transiently loaned to us the miraculous power to see that on a certain day and hour the sun is to be eclipsed, as it would be to be so versed in the cosmic laws which determine the positions of the heavenly bodies as to know that on that certain day and hour the sun *must* be eclipsed. Insight is vastly more than foresight, and indeed contains foresight.

The Century Magazine has just completed a series of papers, under the title of "The Autobiography of Joseph Jefferson." They are the reminiscences of an actor, and they appeal to a play-going audience throughout. But there are hints here and there, in this last paper especially, well worthy the attention of another audience than that. "I have seen impulsive actors, who were so confident of their power, that they left all to chance." "We must not mistake vagueness for suggestion, and imagine that because we understand the matter we are necessarily conveying it to others." These and many other shrewd observations are here, with appropriate and telling illustration.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Mr. Gladstone's articles in *Good Words* on the "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture" came to a close with the issue for November. The last is the most effective of them all. The attitude of defence hitherto most fully adopted, is not, we submit, the most successful either for Holy Scripture or for Mr. Gladstone. Content with defence, one runs the inevitable risk of conceding and conciliating till the rock either gets too narrow for foothold or too commonplace to be worth the struggle. But here Mr. Gladstone proceeds to the direct attack; and immediately the victory gets immensely more hopeful and more worth hoping for.

Singling out Professor Huxley, "the Achilles of the opposing army," as the representative of the scientific agnostic, Mr. Gladstone proposes "to inquire pretty strictly whether the professors of science are sometimes apt to push their legitimate authority beyond their own bounds into provinces where it becomes an usurpation, and whether the weapons which they hurl are then always 'weapons of precision.'" (This phrase is Professor Huxley's own. In the *Nineteenth Century* for July 1890, Professor Huxley fluctuates between pity and a good-natured contempt for "the old-fashioned artillery of the churches" in contrast with "the weapons of precision" used by the advancing forces of science.) First, then, as to usurpation, "What right," he asks, "has Professor Huxley to close this question? The question whether the Creation story of Genesis describes solar days or not, is no more a scientific question than whether Parliament should or should not meet in November, or whether Shakespeare wrote or did not write the whole of *Henry the Eighth*." There is heart and courage here, of another order than that of the forlorn hope. There is victory for us as well as for him. But to secure a victory, it is well to spike the enemy's guns. Accordingly, "I have now to ask," says Mr. Gladstone, "whether the weapons used by this most distinguished scientist are always 'weapons of precision.'" He chooses the narrative of the Deluge. The Mosaic account assigns a period of one hundred and fifty days (the Tablets give only seven) for the subsidence of the waters. Against this statement Mr. Huxley advances a *dictum*, of which the subject-matter is unquestionably scientific. He gives the length of the Mesopotamian plain at 300 to 400 miles, and the elevation of the higher end at 500 to 600 feet. Had this plain been so covered with water, says Mr. Huxley, a 'furious torrent' would have rushed downwards, and, instead of a hundred and fifty days, the plain generally would have been left bare in a very few hours. The case, says Mr. Gladstone, is one of elementary hydraulics, and he very properly adds that "if we may not ask from the scientific man that when he touches questions of the innermost feelings of believers, and of the highest destinies of man, he should be reverent, yet surely we are entitled to require of him that he should be circumspect; that he should take reasonable care to include in his survey of a case all elements which are obviously essential to a right judgment

upon it." Professor Huxley has not done so here. For a fall of 525 feet in 350 miles gives one foot and a half per mile, or a gradient of $\frac{1}{3420}$; and Mr. Gladstone is informed by "an engineer, who is in charge of a portion of one of our rivers," that such a fall would probably produce a current of about two miles an hour. Thus to represent as a "furious torrent" what is in truth an extremely slow stream, is not to use a "weapon of precision," at least it will require all Professor Huxley's resources to show that it is.

Professor Huxley's gibe about "the Gadarene pig affair" does not prevent Mr. Gladstone from using the miracle at Gergesa as a further illustration of his contention that Mr. Huxley sometimes thrusts his weapon where it has no right to be, and that it is not always a true weapon he handles. Mr. Huxley observes that in the record of this miracle the evangelist has no "inkling of the legal and moral difficulties of the case;" that the devils entered into the swine "to the great loss and damage of the innocent Gerasene or Gadarene pig-owners;" and that "everything that I know of law and justice convinces me that the wanton destruction of other people's property is a misdemeanour of evil example." "So then," is Mr. Gladstone's reply (and here again we think he is at his best, though he afterwards discusses the legal and moral questions with skill and effect),—"so then, after eighteen centuries of worship offered to our Lord by the most cultivated, the most developed, and the most progressive portion of the human race, it has been reserved to a scientific inquirer to discover that He was no better than a law-breaker and an evil-doer. It is sometimes said that the greatest discoveries are the most simple. And this, if really a discovery, is the simplest of them all. So simple that he who runs may read, for it lies on the very surface of the page. The ordinary reader can only put the wondering question, How, in such a matter, came the honours of originality to be reserved to our time and to Professor Huxley?"

Further on in this important article, Mr. Gladstone states a conviction which, as he says, it is difficult to express in an unexceptionable manner, but which, nevertheless, really stands in no need of apology, for thinking men everywhere admit the truth of it, and it is a commonplace in theology. It is that the cause, "the main operative cause," of negation or scepticism is not intellectual but moral. Mr. Gladstone does not mean that the elevation of moral character in individuals varies with and according to the amount of their dogmatic belief. Such a statement would certainly be "Pharisaical in the worse sense of the word." What he does mean is, that negation or scepticism is essentially the choice of things seen in preference to things unseen,—a scriptural statement,—and that is manifestly a moral and not an intellectual choice. To make a modern and individual application of the principle may be dangerous in the extreme (though one cannot forget a recent intensely painful admission on this head), but we may recall the very striking instance recorded by St. John (xi. 47–53) of Caiaphas and the Jewish Sanhedrin. With them the choice lay between the reality of the claims of Jesus, claims which penetrated into the unseen and had their validity there, and their own present authority, their seen and felt prosperity and comfort. Whereupon Caiaphas uttered his one true oracle, choosing for himself and the rulers (though the word he used was "the people") the seen rather than the unseen; and in so doing he made a moral, and in no sense an intellectual, choice. Indeed, the intellect was all on the side of Jesus and His claims. "This man doeth many signs"—it was not denied, it was the occasion of their assembling, it was the argument that made Christ's death an urgent necessity. It is an instance in which the immorality of the negation is clear and crushing. In modern life it is not always so clear and crushing, but it is true now, for it is true always and everywhere that faith —watch the word, it is not *belief*, a word which the Scriptures scarcely know—has no relation to the accumulation of proofs which appeal to the intellect; it is true now, for it is true always and everywhere, that after rejecting the evidence of the "signs," including the resurrection from the dead, we can be inconsistent enough to cry, "If He be the Christ, let Him come down from the Cross and we will believe Him;" it is true now that if we believe not Moses and the prophets neither will we be persuaded though one rose from the dead.

Mr. Gladstone's introduction of the "engineer" recalls the paper of the Dean of Armagh, read at the recent Church Congress. To Dr. Chadwick it is the weapons of the Higher Critics that are not "weapons of precision"; and he too, like Mr. Gladstone, seeks the aid of an expert. The point being one of military engineering, Lord Wolseley is the authority chosen, who sends "a calculation in detail with a diagram." The point is Kuenen's objection to the narrative of the fall of Jericho, that "it is utterly impossible that Israel's fighting men, 600,000 in number, could have marched round the city for six consecutive days, and on the seventh day even seven times." Dr. Chadwick's answer is that 600,000 is the aggregate given in Num. v. 46, not of the warriors but of the whole number capable of bearing arms. Comparing Num. xxii. 21 with Josh. iv. 12, he shows that the two tribes and a half had 108,000 armed males, yet they entered Palestine only 40,000 strong. A like proportion would give not 600,000 but 222,000 men to march round Jericho; and Lord Wolseley proves that, apart from special difficulties of ground, an army of 300,000 men or more, moving in three columns, "might easily encompass" an eastern town as stated.

Dr. Chadwick's paper formed one of a most interesting series of papers and speeches at the Congress on the Inspiration of Scripture and its relation to Modern Criticism. Another was by Canon Tristram, who chose as his special subject the testimony of recent Monumental Discovery to the truth of the Old Testament. It is a subject full of interest and importance, especially in respect of its bearing upon the methods and results of the Higher Criticism. Professor Sayce, who has just gone to spend the winter in the East, will contribute one or more papers upon this subject to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. They will be more valuable from being written in the very presence of the monuments, whose secrets Professor Sayce has done so much to reveal.

It is often said that the problems of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament belong to experts in Hebrew scholarship, on the ground that they can be decided only by an examination of the language of the various books "in its original form." But it is not so. No one can read either Kuenen's *Religion of Israel* or Wellhausen's *History of Israel* without perceiving that the points most fully relied upon are such as any person who possesses a fairly accurate translation of the Hebrew, such as the Revised Version, may fully appreciate. Indeed, it is increasingly felt that the form of the language is that upon which the least confidence of all must be placed, and that for the simple reason that "in its *original* form" it can no longer be seen. This was put with clearness and force at the Church Congress by Dr. Rawson Lumby, Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, in a speech which, unfortunately, has been far too much condensed in the reporting. That we do not possess the Book of Genesis in the very language in which it was written—not to speak of the earlier documents which were incorporated into in—he showed to be more than probable, from the fact that the written characters were certainly not the same as those in which the Books of the Old Testament have come down to us; and from the still more significant fact that one Hebrew grammar serves to instruct a person in the language (with a few remarkable exceptions) from Genesis to Chronicles. It is perfectly possible, therefore, he said, that after the Captivity the books were transcribed throughout, and the phraseology and forms of the words altered and made very much alike, and that without impairing the truth of the records themselves. He holds, therefore, that the Higher Criticism must rely upon other evidence than that of language, for, though the Book of Deuteronomy can be shown to have a phraseology which corresponds with the time of Jeremiah, there are other differences which, in his judgment, mark it as the composition of a time far anterior to that of Jeremiah. Thus, in the literature of the Psalms and the Prophets, there are anticipations of a future state and references to rewards to be given elsewhere than in this world: in the Book of Deuteronomy there is an absence of all such reference, which shows that it belongs to a time when this revelation had not yet been made.

It is with sorrow we notice the death of Mr. James Fyfe, of Bradford, the author of the recently issued and really valuable book, *The Hereafter*. Three

important and appreciative reviews of the work come to hand together,—one in the *Church Quarterly Review*, one in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, and one in the *Theological Monthly*. The second of these reviews, though it makes a mistake when it describes Mr. Fyfe as a British clergyman, gives an admirable conspectus of the work in a single sentence: "Its general aim is, first of all, to bring out into full view the entire teaching of Scripture in regard to the eternal world, and then to discuss in the light thus furnished by Revelation the several problems of annihilation, of conditional immortality, of restorationism, and of eternal retribution."

But the notice to which we wish specially to refer is that of the *Church Quarterly*. Here a criticism is made which, if true, involves us in a doctrine, of which it is not enough to say that there is a "long-standing Protestant prejudice" against it. We believe there is a Christian objection to it of longer standing; and a scriptural repudiation of it that goes back to the very beginning. It is the doctrine of Purgatory. The criticism arises over the word *Sheol* (שְׁאוֹל), the Hebrew word which corresponds with the Greek word *Hades* (ἅδης). Both are translated sometimes "hell" and sometimes "grave," and in the Revised Version they have been frequently left untranslated, simply transliterated. Mr. Fyfe holds that, in so far as Sheol is the place of the departed righteous, it is identical with the heaven where God reigns. "Such an idea," says the *Church Quarterly* reviewer, "was contrary to all Bible notions, Sheol being the under world, whereas the heaven where God reigns is the upper world." The fundamental notion in the Jewish mind was, he says, deliverance from Sheol—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol"; and the doctrine of the resurrection was nothing else but the doctrine of this deliverance. Sheol, therefore, is the intermediate state—in one word, *Purgatory*. And if we are to get rid of the great stumbling-block to eternal punishment, which, he says, is not its eternity, but its immediacy, the doctrine that heaven and hell are the immediate issues of this life, we must return to "the primitive doctrine of Hades, or the intermediate state with all its possibilities."

Primitive or not, if the doctrine of Purgatory is a scriptural doctrine we *must* return to it, and we cannot return too soon. But what is the proof? We find here these two—(1) That the devout Hebrew pleaded that his soul might not be left in Sheol; and (2) that Christ went down to Sheol at His death, from whence he returned at His resurrection on the third day, and it was forty days before He ascended into heaven. As for this second proof: What, then, is the meaning of Christ's words to the penitent robber, "*To-day* shalt thou be with me in Paradise?" But we believe both "proofs" are fully met by the simple statement that it is the believer's *body* that finds its place in Sheol, while the spirit goes direct "to God who gave it." Numerous are the passages which at once yield this result, a result which alone agrees with the Apostle's desire "rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." But it is of more importance to notice one which seems to contradict it; that is to say, the Psalmist's words, "Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in Sheol" (Ps. xvi. 10).

The best discussion of the doctrine of Sheol which we have seen is by Professor Shedd, of New York, in a small book entitled *The Doctrine of Endless Punishment* (Nisbet, 1886, 5s.). There an important note may be found on this passage, of which the main points are these:—First, the Hebrew word *nephesh* (נֶפֶשׁ) translated here "soul"—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol"—is sometimes used of the *body* of a dead man. It it so used in Num. vi. 6, "He shall come at no dead body (נֶפֶשׁ מֵת)," and in several other places. Again, the word *Sheol* frequently signifies no more than the "grave" where the dead body is laid, without regard to retribution or reward. Thus, "Ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave" (Gen. xlii. 38). Of the former of these two positions, there can be no question; an examination of scriptural usage puts it beyond doubt; and it is not confined to Scripture. Says Augustine: "That, under the name of *soul*, the body only should be meant, is in accordance with a style of speaking which designates the thing containing by the name of the thing contained." In English we say that "a hundred souls were lost when the ship went down," by an exactly parallel metonymy. As to

the second position, it is objected that Sheol cannot mean the grave simply, since there is another word for grave—namely, *ḳeber* (קֶבֶר). But the meanings are quite distinct. As Professor Shedd says, *Sheol* is the grave in its abstract and general sense, while *ḳeber* is concrete and particular. *Ḳeber* is the individual tomb or sepulchre. Moses is in the grave, but "no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day."

Thus when the Psalmist pleaded, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol," it is open for us to translate his words, "Thou wilt not leave my body in the grave," and fix his meaning accordingly.

And that that *was* his meaning we surely have the authority of the New Testament; for it does not seem that St. Peter's quotation and application of the words can be explained in any other way.

This, it will be remembered, is the historical proof of the resurrection of Jesus with which St. Peter closes his great Pentecostal address (Acts ii. 25–31). Premising that what has been said of *Sheol* and *nephesh* is also true of their Greek equivalents, *Hades* and *psyché*, we perceive that St. Peter regards the words "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades" as only another way of saying "Thou wilt not suffer my flesh to see corruption," according to the well-known rule of Hebrew parallelism. That David could not have used these words of himself, the Apostle proves by the fact that David having died and been buried, "his sepulchre is with us unto this day." David spoke of a resurrection,—there is no resurrection of the *soul*,—but obviously he did not speak of his own body's resurrection; at least, in the first instance. No; "being a prophet," he "spake of the resurrection of Christ, that *His* body was not left in the grave, neither did His flesh see corruption."

Which is the best modern book on Preaching? In reference to the note upon Dr. Behrends' Yale Lectures in our last issue, a communication has been received from the Rev. T. S. Dickson, M.A., Edinburgh, whose knowledge of American books is very full and accurate. The most *original* course in the Yale Series, he says, was by Dr. Burton (Horace Bushnell's successor), published, with other matter posthumously, in 1888, and not reprinted in this country: a delightfully suggestive book. Our own experience is that as much enjoyment and stimulus could be had from Dr. Phillips Brooks' Lectures as from any; while for solid instruction Dr. R. W. Dale's "Nine Lectures" certainly take a very high place. But the subject is an important one, and we should be glad of some well-informed judgments. Meantime, it is with the greatest pleasure we direct attention to the re-issue, revised and enlarged, of Bishop Dupanloup's volume (*The Ministry of Preaching: An Essay on Pastoral and Popular Oratory*, by Mgr. Félix Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans. Translated by S. J. Eales, D.C.L. London: Griffith & Farran, 1890, 3s. 6d.). A full review of the book has recently appeared in the *Methodist Times* (Nos. 305, 306), by a well-known authority on books, Professor Banks, of Headingley College. We cannot review it fully here. But we may record our own impressions in a few sentences. The Preface is the raciest thing in the book, and the best defence of popular (the word is well guarded) preaching we have met with. The Lectures deal with their subject in four divisions: The pastoral message, says the author, should be before all things a *living* message; then the pastoral message should be an *instructive* message; thirdly, an *apologetic* message; and fourthly, an *edifying* message. As a sermon to sermon-makers, the second is itself a most instructive message; but the great preacher seems most at home when delivering the "word of exhortation," as he afterwards names the fourth division of his subject.

What meaning did the Revisers intend to convey when they translated Gal. ii. 16, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, *save* through faith in Jesus Christ?" Did they purposely admit what has been called "a mixed justification by faith and works?" Dr. Perowne, in an appendix to his *Galatians* (elsewhere noticed), holds that, if words have any meaning, that is what their translation teaches; for it must be remembered that their Version is a *correction* of the Authorised, which has "but by the faith," an expression which clearly enough excludes works. There is no doubt the phrase in question (ἐὰν μὴ) always means "except" or "save." But to give it that translation here, and bring out the Apostle's meaning, it would be necessary, with Lightfoot, to repeat the verb; "He is not justified from works of law, he is not justified *except* through faith." If that was not open to the Revisers, they ought surely to have left the exclusive word "but" of the A.V., or even strengthened it by "only"—*but only*, which Dr. Perowne adopts. The alternative before them was grammar or sense, and they chose grammar.

*

The Inspiration of the Bible and Modern Criticism.

By the Very Rev. J. J. Stewart Perowne, D.D., Dean of Peterborough.

"From a babe thou hast known the sacred writings which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work."—2 Tim. iii. 15–17. (R.V.)

The changes introduced by the Revisers in this passage have provoked some sharp criticism. They have been assailed not merely as pedantic and unnecessary, but as indicative of unsoundness in the faith. "At a period of prevailing unbelief in the inspiration of Scripture, nothing," it has been said, "but a real necessity would warrant any meddling with such a testimony as that contained in the Authorised Version to the inspiration of the Bible. We have hitherto been taught to believe," the writer continues, "that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for the several ends enunciated. The ancients clearly so interpreted St. Paul's words, and so do the most learned and thoughtful moderns. Every Scripture must needs mean every portion, and therefore the whole of Scripture." The critic, as is not unusual with him, furnishes the answer to his own criticism. If every Scripture must needs mean every portion, and therefore the whole of Scripture, there is no denial here of the inspiration of Scripture as a whole. Nor again is that inspiration less clearly asserted by the transference of the predicate to the attribute. It can make no difference as to the fact of inspiration whether I say, "All Scripture is inspired, and therefore profitable," or, "All Scripture, as inspired, is also profitable." In both cases the inspiration of Scripture remains. I assume in the one case what I assert in the other. Moreover, it is not true that the ancients clearly interpreted St. Paul's words in the sense of the Authorised Version, for Origen, the earliest of the Christian fathers who refers to them, paraphrases in the sense of the Revised Version, "Every Scripture as inspired of God, is profitable," and many ancient interpreters are on the same side. Among the moderns who have preferred the rendering adopted by the Revisers may be mentioned Luther, Erasmus, and Grotius, to say nothing of more recent commentators. But, in truth, it may be fairly argued that the Revisers' rendering goes beyond, rather than falls short, of the Authorised Version, in its assertion of the inspiration of Scripture. "Every Scripture inspired of God" refers plainly to the collection of sacred books of which St. Paul had already said that Timothy was acquainted with them from his earliest childhood. Every one of these sacred writings, he continues, each portion of that Divine library, as being full of the breath of God, has its purpose in teaching, controlling, guiding, disciplining the life, that the man of God, the Christian prophet, may be thoroughly equipped unto all good works.

What St. Paul here asserts as to the characteristic purport and scope of Divine revelation cannot be too carefully borne in mind. The writings of the Old Testament—for of these, of course, he is speaking, though his testimony concerning them may be extended to the New—are inspired of God; there is a Divine breath of life in them in a sense which appertains to no human composition. They are, as St. Stephen says, "living oracles," or, as Luther says, "they have hands and feet." They are not for an age, but for all time. They touch human life at every point. They grow with the growing ages. We cannot, indeed, define the nature of inspiration, any more than we can define the nature of life, but it may be felt if it cannot be analysed. And having this Divine life in them, the Scriptures manifest it by their purpose and their effects. St. Paul tells us that they are "able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus," and that they are profitable for the whole education of the Christian life.

In other words, the whole meaning of the Old Testament may be summed up in two words—*redemption* and *sanctification*. On the one hand, it is one vast prophetic testimony to Christ, to His person, to His work, to His kingdom; on the other, it is the Divine method of teaching man through the facts of history and the various circumstances of life how to subdue the evil within him, and to become conformed in very truth to that image of God in which he was originally created. Whereas we are sometimes told that to insist upon any correspondence between prediction and fulfilment in the Old Testament is to degrade the ancient prophets to the level of the soothsayer or the gipsy fortune-teller, it would be much truer to say that the whole Old Testament is one vast prediction. From its first page to its last, it is occupied with one glorious hope. This is its marked and singular characteristic. No Jewish legislator, prophet, or singer ever looks back to the past with fond regret. Each looks forward with ardent longing for the advent of the coming Deliverer. This is the golden thread which runs through that marvellously diversified web of law and history, of

song and fable, of proverb and allegory, by which the Old Testament is marked. Christ is the sum and substance of all its law, its poetry, its ritual, its prophecies. The lives and devout aspirations of all holy men of old point to Him. Without Him these ancient writings, as St. Augustine says, have no point or meaning, but are flat, stale, and unprofitable. Behold Him in them all, and they become at once instinct with life and beauty; or, as the same Father profoundly says, "The New Testament is latent in the Old, the Old patent in the New."

Now I think we cannot too clearly or too firmly grasp the principle thus laid down by St. Paul. By inspiration we are to understand that influence of the Spirit of God upon the writers of the Old Testament, by which they were empowered to teach such spiritual truths, and in such measure as was necessary for the religious welfare of those whom they addressed. Inspiration does not imply that the writers were lifted altogether above the level of their contemporaries in matters of plainly secular import. They do not antedate the science of the nineteenth century. Marvellous as is their historical accuracy, it does not imply supernatural infusion of knowledge on subjects lying within their own observation. They were the faithful witnesses and recorders of the things which they themselves had seen and heard. But, unhappily, Christian apologists have not been content with this recognition of the Divine character of the Scriptures. They insist upon a certain ideal perfection to which the Scriptures themselves make no claim. They forget, or they deny, that these books come to us subject to the same accidents as other books. God has not been pleased to give us an infallible text. We must collate manuscripts; we must study versions; we must with much labour and skill construct a text; we must use our grammars and dictionaries if we would know the correct sense of difficult passages; and we must avail ourselves of all the ordinary methods of criticism if we would ascertain when the different books were written, to what authors they are to be assigned, how far they are original or of a composite character. In a word, we have this treasure in human vessels. The books are given us in a form which invites, and even compels, criticism, and we must be prepared without prejudice, without fear, without any *a priori* postulates, to face the problems which a critical study of them involves.

I wish to ask your attention to one or two salient instances in which these Old Testament writings have recently been made the subject of criticism. I ask you to do this in a spirit of perfect candour and perfect fearlessness. I ask you to do this, holding in my own heart the profound conviction that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God. I could no more doubt the existence of a Divine Author of Nature, than I could doubt the evidence of a Divine Author of Scripture. There may be, there are, difficulties in the one—as our greatest apologist, Bishop Butler, has reminded us—as there are mysteries in the other, that we cannot explain. Nature herself has her strange portents, her abnormal growths and developments, her hideous caricatures of animal and vegetable life. Are we, therefore, to say that these things are conclusive evidence that God is not the Author of Nature? No! the footsteps of Divinity are visible alike, both in Nature and in Scripture, and will surely be seen by the reverent eye and the patient and disciplined heart.

A very bold and novel theory has been started recently as to the form, structure, and dates of the Books of Moses and the Book of Joshua. The latest criticism declares not only that these books are of a composite character,—which is now very generally admitted,—but that they have been antedated by centuries, and that they are a strange conglomerate put together quite regardless of their true order. There may be a small nucleus of Mosaic legislation in Exodus, we are told, but even that is uncertain; Deuteronomy is a repetition and expansion of this by a prophetical writer in the time of Josiah or at the earliest in that of Manasseh; then comes the code of Ezekiel, then a portion of Leviticus, and then, lastly, the great bulk of the Levitical legislation, which, together with its historical setting, is as late as the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. This in brief outline is the theory. I cannot accept it myself, notwithstanding the learning with what it has been expounded, and notwithstanding the fact that several scholars, working quite independently, have arrived practically at the same results. It seems to me it can only be maintained by disregarding one set of facts, while stress is laid upon another. But then I believe also that it is not wholly devoid of foundation. The literary analysis of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch) does lead us to the conclusion that it is not a homogeneous whole, but consists of several different documents which a later editor or editors have arranged in their present position. What is there, I ask, in such a view of its composition to alarm us? The composite character of the work is not necessarily at variance even with the Mosaic authorship of the greater portion. What more natural than that traditions should have been preserved in the family of Abraham, which Moses afterwards incorporated in his work? We know by comparison of the Books of Kings and Chronicles that there has been a large incorporation of such documents into the texture of these histories. Each writer appeals to earlier records in proof of his veracity. Even in the Hexateuch itself we find traces of similar appeals, quotations for instance, from the Book of

the Wars of Jehovah, from a Moabite ballad, from the Book of Jashar. And yet more than this. We observe, scattered over its pages, notices of events subsequent to the occupation of the land of Canaan, such as compel us to admit that, even if the bulk of the Pentateuch is Mosaic, the hand of an editor as late as the time of the Kings is discernible in bringing it into its present shape. How are we to deal with difficulties of this kind? Because we believe the books to be inspired, are we to resort to methods of explanation which we should be ashamed to resort to in dealing with a profane author, and bend and twist and force the facts into accordance with what we assume to be the exigencies of Divine revelation? Take the whole theory of the reconstruction of the six books. Is it, even in its extreme form, necessarily antagonistic to faith? Does it necessarily destroy the basis of any moral or spiritual truth? If it could be proved that the prophets were before the Law, would that make their teaching less valuable? Is the Old Testament, regarded as an instrument in the Divine education of the world, dependent altogether on the date of the books, or the certain authorship of any of them in its existing form?

We are told, indeed, that the Pentateuch itself claims to be the work of Moses. We are told that the authority of our Lord has for ever determined the question; for He acknowledged the Pentateuch as Mosaic, and His authority is sovereign and absolute. But where has Moses himself, where has our Lord, where have any of His apostles asserted that the whole Pentateuch in its present form was written by Moses? Of certain portions we are told that Moses "wrote them in a book"; of the law of Deuteronomy it is said, "Moses wrote this law," but not of the Book of Deuteronomy, "Moses wrote this book." Indeed, he could not have written the story of his own death. Our Lord, it is true, allows the Mosaic origin of the Law, "Moses gave you the law:" our Lord says explicitly, "Moses wrote of me," and quotes words of the Pentateuch as words of Moses; but He has nowhere asserted that each and every portion of the Pentateuch as we have it now came direct from the hand of the Jewish lawgiver, or that the Pentateuch was deposited by the side of the ark.

I will not enter on the question which has been so much debated of late as to the limitation of our Lord's human nature; though, unless there was some limitation I do not understand how it could be a perfect human nature at all. The subject is one on which we do well not to speak rashly. But even if we admit that He in His human nature had a supernatural illumination vouchsafed to Him as to the authorship and criticism of the sacred books, can we suppose that it was any part of His mission to settle questions like these? Would it not have led men's minds away from the eternal truth that He came to teach, if He had descended into the arena of critical disquisition? It was a moot question among the Rabbis of His day whether the Book of Ecclesiastes had been rightly received into the canon. Nowhere does He allude to the question of authorship or canonicity; nowhere does He quote it. In His citation of the books of the Old Testament He accepts the popular belief as to their authorship. How should He have done otherwise? To say this is not to imply that He was inferior in knowledge to modern critics, or that, "as a teacher of religion, He was a teacher of error." For even, if error there was, it was not one He thought it necessary to correct, it was not one that touched religion. There is only one place in the Gospels in which He has apparently pledged Himself to the authorship of a particular writing. He does say very emphatically of the 110th Psalm, as St. Mark and St. Luke give us the words, "David Himself saith"; but even of that statement the devout and saintly Neander can write that we are not driven to the alternative, either to accept the Davidic authorship or deny our Lord's infallibility and truthfulness; that even in that, His most explicit utterance, He may merely have adopted the current traditions of His time.

But, in truth, are we not all along fettering ourselves unnecessarily with theories? The Bible is not, as a matter of fact, composed on some ideal theory of perfection. The writers do sometimes allow themselves a freedom which must rudely shake our theories. I read, for instance, in the First Book of Chronicles (xvi. 8–22) that David delivered a certain psalm into the hands of Asaph and his brethren for use in the Temple services. When I examine that psalm, I find that it is made up of several others, of the 96th, 105th, 107th, and 106th. All of these psalms are most probably post-exilic; one, at least, is so beyond all question, for it contains a prayer to be gathered from the hand of the heathen. What am I to say to a fact like this? Am I to say the writer of Chronicles is misleading me, or shall I not rather say that He is merely reporting a certain tradition that David was the founder of the Levitical psalmody in the Temple; and that hence to the chronicler this composite psalm used in the Temple worship of his own day seemed to be a kind of summary or representation of what David had given into the hands of the Levitical choir? He was no critic, he took the tradition as he found it. What is there in this certain fact to shock our faith? Why not acknowledge that forms of composition are allowable in the Bible, which we all admit in profane authors to be allowable?

Again, as regards the use of different documents in the Bible, what is there to alarm us? Why should we hesitate to make the frank ad-

mission that at the very opening of our Bibles we do meet with different documents? Look at the first story of creation in Genesis. What a wonderful chapter it is! Regarded even as a piece of writing, there is nothing finer in literature. How perfect it is in its structure! What a majestic progression from its first word, "Let there be light," to its last, "Let us make man in our own image!" Amid all its variety, one great creative word gives it a sublime unity. It is like some great oratorio in which the dominant theme is never lost amid all the infinite compass and richness of its variations; or like some majestic cathedral whose harmonious proportions arrest the eye, where aisle answers to aisle, and shaft to shaft, and column to column, and all are held in submission to the master design, and where the sense of power and dignified repose are marvellously blended. And then pass from this to the second story of creation in the next chapter. How striking is the contrast! It is a tale of childhood, simple and unartificial. "The smell of fresh earth is on the breeze." The man formed, a solitary being out of the dust of the earth, the animals created and brought to him, that he may give them their names, and no helpmeet found among them all,—as it were an experiment made, and its failure recorded, —the deep sleep cast upon Adam, the woman formed out of the rib, the Lord God walking in the garden at the cool of the day, how infinite is the charm of the *naïveté*, and the childlikeness of the whole scene! But how unlike the stately march, the elaborate structure, the rhythmic balance and poise so conspicuous in the earlier story! Is it not clear that we have two documents? Do we lose anything by the admission? Do we not rather gain? Does not the richness, the beauty, the Divinity of the inspired narrative come out in livelier and more striking colours?

Shall I turn, for one moment, before I conclude, to the objections which are urged from the side of science? I am told by men who, standing in the foremost rank of scientific observers, are also devout believers in our Lord, that it is impossible to reconcile the story of creation as given in Genesis, except in its broad outlines, with the discoveries of science. Is it not enough for me to know that in its broad outlines, at all events, there is this correspondence? And shall I not be content with the fact that in moral grandeur it stands absolutely alone amongst the cosmogonies of the world? What are the sublime facts I learn from that magnificent prologue? The creation of the universe by the voice of the Almighty, as in opposition to all dualistic or Pantheistic speculations; the beginning of life as the immediate work of God; the matchless and perfect order; the gradual advance from lower forms and types of being to higher, until man is reached, the roof and crown of all; the lofty destiny of man as made in the image of God, and gifted with rule over all the creatures of His hands; the Divine approval resting visibly on the work at each stage thereof—in a word, these great truths, that a personal God is the Creator; that God is a God of order and love; that this glorious universe in all its parts is the work of His fingers, and not the offspring of a blind chance, or the evolution of an inexorable destiny; that there was a gradual preparation for man before he appeared upon the earth, and that there is a close and intimate relation between man and God. These are truths of religion which no science can ever touch; these are truths which are without parallel in the cosmogonies of other nations; truths such as no "Hebrew Descartes or Newton" could ever have discovered for himself. They are altogether out of the path and beyond the methods of human intelligence in its most patient endeavour or its most daring flight. They can only come of the inspiration of God. This is the marvel, that not one spiritual truth which is here asserted can be overturned. What, then, does it matter whether we can or cannot make out a scheme of reconciliation between Genesis and geology and astronomy? Of that first page of the Bible, as of every other, it is true that it is "able to make us wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus," and that "as given by inspiration of God it is profitable for our instruction."

The cardinal error of theologians, it seems to me, is this: that they will start with a theory. It is with theology as it was with science. The students of science began with their theories. The earth must be a flat surface. The earth must be the centre of the universe, and the sun and planets must revolve around it. So long as men insisted upon their theory, and bent and twisted the facts to suit that theory, the gates of knowledge were shut against them; but when they sat down with humble, teachable, reverent minds to ascertain what the laws of God s universe were, then patience and humility had their reward, then the mysteries of the universe were revealed to their gaze; then its glorious and perfect order were disclosed, and science went forth conquering and to conquer. And is it not so with the Bible? So long as we start with our theories of what the Bible ought to be, instead of humbly trying to ascertain what the Bible is, we shall assuredly only increase our doubts and difficulties, and give large room to unbelief. We have been told that the Bible must be free from every flaw of imperfection, and we find it is not so. We have been told that the Bible must be in accordance with the discoveries of science, and we find science says one thing and the Bible another. We have been told that discrepancies ought not to exist, and we find they do exist. And then, alas, too often with the

rejection of the theory that has broken down, there comes the rejection of the Bible also. Is it not better to admit the facts? Is it not better to discard the theory, and to fall back on the words of the great Apostle, "Every Scripture as inspired of God is also profitable for our spiritual edification."

It is the trial of our day that we are called to face these problems, and there must be some searchings of heart; but let us face them boldly! Above all things, let us be honest. That, believe me, is the truest reverence. True reverence does not consist in shutting our eyes to facts, or in dealing with the Bible in a way in which we should be ashamed to deal with secular writings. True reverence walks ever with fearless front because her eye is fixed upon God. We need not fear lest the authority of the Bible should be endangered. The Bible cannot be endangered except by the timidity or want of honesty of its defenders. Never let us deny facts whatever the conclusion may be to which they lead us. Facts are God's work. Criticism has its legitimate province. It may be an instrument in the hands of God for bringing us to a truer view of the Bible than that with which we have hitherto been content. We may be forced to admit that our theory is wrong. We cannot be forced to admit that the Bible is not a fountain of Divine wisdom, comfort, illumination, blessing to him who studies it with reverent, humble, prayerful heart. There is our safeguard. No criticism can be too searching, no investigation too thorough, provided that we have first sought on our knees for the illumination of that Holy Spirit by whom men of God spoke of old time, and whose presence makes every page luminous with unearthly light. "Open Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy law"—that prayer will never remain unanswered. Criticism and faith each asserting its own right, no longer antagonistic, but in perfect harmony and co-operation, will make the Bible speak to us with a voice more distinct, more powerful, more helpful than it has ever spoken before. It will be a new revelation to our age. We shall be led into all the truth, and know with full assurance of conviction, and to our great and endless comfort, that "every Scripture as inspired of God is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work."

Dr. Maclaren's New Book.

The Holy of Holies. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. London: Alexander & Shepheard. 1890. 5s.

When Dr. Maclaren of Manchester was in Australia recently, he said that he attributed any use or influence which he had been able to exert, in the direction of stimulating and influencing young ministers, to two things. First, hard work at the Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament. For many years after his college life he had never let a day pass without reading a chapter in each, and if those who could do so laid this down as a rule of life, and drew their teaching from the true foundation of spiritual power, the word of God in the Holy Bible, they would not miss their mark. Secondly, to the fact that from the beginning of his ministry he had endeavoured to make his preaching expository and explanatory of the Word of God as he understood it. Why so many people were tired of preaching was because some ministers merely took a text on which to hang pretty things, without any regard to its true meaning. If God thought it worth while to give them a book, surely they should give its truths the meaning which He designed.

In the course of that visit, a friend in New Zealand strongly urged Dr. Maclaren to write on John xiv. to xvii., "since he had the requisite nicety and delicacy of touch for so sacred a task;" and he replied, "with moist eyes and tremulous voice," that he should much like to do so.

The wish has been realised. Immediately after his return he commenced to preach from the fourteenth chapter, and he has now finished the sixteenth. The sermons have appeared week by week in the *Freeman*, and now his publishers issue a volume containing the series, called *The Holy of Holies*.

It is enough to mention Dr. Maclaren's sermons in order to recommend them. No finer volume of sermons has been published this season.

"The Critical Review:"

The Critical Review of Theological and Philosophical Literature.

Edited by Professor S. D. F. Salmond, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

The first number of the new Quarterly has been out for some weeks now, and has met with a welcome which proves at once the widespread desire for such a Review, and the success with which the editor has met it. Names like those of Dr. Rainy, Dr. Plummer, Professor Davidson, Canon Driver, Professor Bruce, Principal Reynolds, and Dr. Dods—to mention in order only the first round number—are a safe guarantee of scholarship and careful writing. The longer reviews are, on the whole, the most valuable, and also the most interesting; but we could name some of the shorter notices which have hit off the characteristics of their books with great skill. If the editor can provide 116 pages of matter for 1s. 6d. and keep it up to this mark, he need have no fear.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xii. 4-6.

"Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all" (R.V).

Exposition.

"*Gifts*" emanate from the Holy Spirit, and are vouchsafed to individuals for the furtherance of the well-being of the Church, and the development of the spiritual life.—*Ellicott.* They are the creative powers which God communicates to believers when their new activity expands under the influence of the life of Christ.—*Godet.* The word is only found in St. Paul's Epistles (except 1 Pet. iv. 10), where it occurs sixteen times. In all cases it denotes "a gift emanating from the Holy Ghost, or the free grace of God."—*Ellicott.*

"*The same Spirit.*"—That the reference is to the blessed Person of the Holy Ghost, and, in the verses following, to the Son and to the Father, cannot possibly be denied by any consistent interpreter.—*Ellicott.*

"*Ministrations*," "charges or ministries," *i.e.* eternal offices, not like the former, inward aptitudes. Some may be related to the whole Church, like the apostolate, or the office of evangelist; others to a particular community, as the numerous branches of the diaconate.—*Godet.*

The "*workings*" are due to the exercise both of the gifts and the offices. They signify the effects produced either in the world of body or of mind, as often as the gift or office comes into action. Thus in a believer the Holy Spirit has developed the *gift* of preaching. Recognising this gift, the Church has committed to him the preacher's *office*, with a view to the service of Christ. Its *working* or *operation* will be the good discourse delivered by him, and the edification thereby affected in the hearts of his hearers.—*Godet.*

The three words — "gifts," "ministrations," "workings"—denote the gifts regarded from three distinct points of view. As they are supernatural conditions of the human spirit, they are immediate graces of the Spirit of God. As their exercise gives rise to various forms of service in the Church, they have respect to the Head of the Church, and in this relation to the Lord Jesus they are ministrations. As they are *effectual* to do this service, their source is in God. This is the threefold relation to the Church, which God the Father, the Lord Christ, and the Holy Spirit are elsewhere represented as maintaining. It is in accord with the intrinsic relations of the Divine Persons to one another (Eph. iv. 4; 1 Pet. i. 2).—*Edwards.*

Critical Note.

The word διαίρεσις (only found in this place of the New Testament) may mean either distributions (*divisiones*, Vulgate), *i.e.* one to one person, and one to another; or, more derivatively, differences (*distinctiones*, Beza), with reference to the difference of the gifts themselves. Owing to the use of the verb, the former meaning is to be preferred.

I have not much doubt that the Apostle uses the word in both meanings. A distribution of gifts involves diversity of gifts.—*Edwards.*

Methods of Treatment.

I.

The Dispensation of the Spirit.

By the Rev. F. W. Robertson.

The Spirit's operation is either on individuals or on the Church as a whole.

1. *Spiritual gifts on Individuals.*—These gifts are of two kinds, natural and supernatural. Among natural gifts are teaching, healing, the power of government. The doctrine of the Apostle is that these natural, personal endowments are transformed and renovated by the Spirit of a new life in such a way as to become almost new powers, or, as he calls them, gifts of the Spirit. Of supernatural gifts, we find two pre-eminent,—the gift of tongues and of prophecy. The gift of tongues was not the mere faculty of speaking foreign languages, but rather that elevation of aspiration and feeling arising from contact with the Spirit of God, which rendered ordinary forms of speech inadequate. Prophecy was not simply prediction, but the power of stating truth distinctly and forcibly. It was less ecstatic than that of tongues.

These gifts did not ensure infallibility, or prevent disorder and vanity. Therefore Paul established laws of control. The spirits of the prophets must be subject to the prophets. Moreover, the supernatural were not necessarily the most useful gifts. "Five words with the understanding" fulfilled the royal law of love better than "ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

2. *The Spiritual Unity of the Church.*—"The same Spirit." (1) All real unity is manifold. Sorrow is the same feeling throughout the human race, but one bursts forth into violent lamentations, while another "holds his peace." By one and the

same law lead sinks in water, wood floats on the surface. (2) All living unity is spiritual, not formal; not sameness, but manifoldness. The Apostle illustrates by the members of the body. (3) None but a spiritual unity can preserve the rights both of the individual and the Church. As there is one universe in which each separate star differs from another in glory, so shall there be one Church of God in which a single Spirit prevades each separate soul.

II.

RELIGION *v.* SCIENCE.

By the late Bishop of Manchester.

"There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit;" and the disputes between religion and science arise when the teacher of the one leaves his own gift and sphere of operation for that of the other. There is no article (as Sir James Paget says) of any of the Christian creeds which can be the subject of direct scientific inquiry. On the other hand, the spirit of scientific inquiry, working along its own lines, has rendered distinguished services to the cause of true religion. (1) It is the prevalence of the scientific temper that, more than anything else, has redeemed religion from superstitious corruptions, affecting both faith and practice. (2) The philosopher has taught the religious inquirer the proper frame of mind in which every inquiry must be pursued—namely, not in order to fortify a foregone conclusion, but simply to discover truth. (3) The philosopher has often shown more faith than the theologian in the conviction embodied in the maxim, "*Magna est veritas, et praevalebit.*" He teaches us to believe in the power of truth to maintain itself by its own proper evidence, without extrinsic aid or unnatural alliances.

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

Diversities of Gifts: the same Spirit.

"EVERY man would like to reproduce himself," was one of Dr. Duncan's acute sayings, "and so turn God's beautiful variety into a hideous uniformity." There was no man whom it would have been harder to reproduce than John Duncan.—*A. Moody Stuart.*

SOME years ago I was with my boy walking the streets of New York. I was pastor of a church at that time in the city. As we came by it, he said, "Is this your church, papa?" And I said, "Yes." When we walked along out toward the square, he pointed to another church, and he said, "Whose church is that?" "Dr. Hastings' church." "Whose church is that?" "Mr. Frothingham's church." "Where is God's church, papa?" That question has stayed with me ever since.—*Lyman Abbott.*

WHO evangelised our ancestors, the Gothic tribes of Northern Europe? It was Ulfilas, an *Arian* bishop. Who established the first missions throughout Central Asia? It was the followers of the once detested Nestorius. Who conveyed the first germs of Christian faith to India and China? It was Francis Xavier, the representative of the Society of Jesuits. Who Christianised Greenland? It was the simple-minded Moravians. Here is diversity of creed enough, and yet the same Spirit wrought with them all.—*Dean Stanley.*

OH, to be like my Lord! Yet must I be
Mine own self too,
And to the nature He bestowed on me
Be frankly true.

The olive fruits not as the clustering vine;
Nor may we get
Scent of the rose or lily from woodbine,
Or violet.

Walter C. Smith.

THERE is a different colour of beauty in different stones that are all of them precious. One man may be burnishing to the sparkle of the diamond, while another is deepening to the glow of the ruby. For this reason there are such different temperaments in Christian character, and varying circumstances in Christian life, that the foundation of the wall of the city may be garnished with all manner of precious stones. . . . It is very beautiful to see how the God, who has bound His world into a grand harmony by its very diversity, has arranged for this same end in His Church by giving the members their different faculties of work—how the pure light that comes from the sun breaks into its separate lines when it touches the palace-house of Christ with its varied cornices and turrets, till every colour lies in tranquil beauty beside its fellow."—*John Ker.*

UNITY of design amidst variety of form is so conspicuous in the works of Nature that the rudest minds perceive it. Less obvious, but not less real or less prevalent, is a unity of design alongside a variety of function. The same bones in different animals are converted into paddles, wings, legs, and arms. It is indeed wonderful to think that the feeble and sprawling paddles of a newt, the ungainly flippers of a seal, and the long leathery wings of a bat, have all the same elements, bone for bone, with that human hand which is the supple instrument of man's contrivance, and is alive, even to the finger-tips, with the power of expressing his intellect and his will.—*The Duke of Argyll; The Reign of Law.*

I HAVE heard Mr. Moody relate that when on the service of the Christian Commission, he put his usual question once to an old planter whom he met, "Are you a Christian?" But the planter was deaf, and Mr. Moody was soon shouting the question in his ear, but still ineffectually. Turning to

the negro who had accompanied the old man, he inquired, "Is your master a Christian?" "No, sah, he's a Prisbyterian.' Much disconcerted, Mr. Moody sought still to turn the conversation to profit, so, addressing the negro, he said, "Are *you* a Christian?" "Yes, sah, I'se a Mefodis."—*E. Eggleston; Scribner's Monthly.*

THE propensity to compare is frequently indulged in foolish and injurious ways. It cuts us to the heart when we hear excellent ministers decried, because they are not like certain others. You cannot logically institute comparisons where they do not hold. Rugged Cephas has his place and order, and he is neither better nor worse, higher nor lower in value, than polished Apollos. No one inquires which is the more useful—a needle or a pin, a spade or a hoe, a waggon or a plough; they are designed for different ends, and answer them well; but they could not exchange places without serious detriment to their usefulness. It is true that A. excels in argumentative power; let him argue, then, for he was made on purpose to convince men's reasons; but because B.'s style is more expository do not despise him, for he was sent not to reason, but to teach. If all the members of the mystical body had the same office and gift, what a wretched malformation it would be; it would hardly be so good as that, for it would not be a formation at all. If all ears, mouths, hands, and feet were turned into eyes, who would hear, eat, grasp, or move? A church with a Luther in every pulpit would be all fist; and with a Calvin to fill every pastorate, she would be all skull. Blessed be God for one Robert Hall; but let the man be whipped who tries in his own person to make a second. Rowland Hill is admirable for once, but it is quite as well that the mould was broken.—*C. H. Spurgeon.*

The Early Christian Writers.

BY THE REV. E. ELMER HARDING, M.A., LICHFIELD.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

Clement of Rome, . *c.* 60–102
Ignatius of Antioch, . *c.* 70–115
Polycarp of Smyrna, . *c.* 86–155

Teaching of Twelve Apostles, *c.* 100
Hermas of Rome, . . . 100
Pseudo-Barnabas of Alexandria, 120
Writer to Diognetus, . . 120
Papias of Hierapolis, 150

APOLOGISTS.

α. Greek.

	FL.
Quadratus of Athens, . .	130
Aristides of Athens, . .	130
Aristo of Pella, . . .	130
Justin Martyr, . . .	150
Claudius Apollinaris, . .	170
Miltiades of Athens, . .	170
Melito of Sardis, . . .	170
Tatian of Assyria, . . .	170
Theophilus of Antioch, . .	180
Athenagoras of Athens, . .	180

β. Latin.

Tertullian of Carthage, .	150–220
Cyprian of Carthage, .	200–258
Minucius Felix, Carthage,	200–250
Commodian of Carthage,	250–300
Novatian of Rome, .	250–300
Arnobius of Sicca, . .	260–300
Lactantius of Sicca, .	300–330

OTHER GREEK WRITERS, SECOND CENTURY.

Dionysius of Corinth, . .	170
Hegesippus, ...	170
Irenæus of Gaul, . . .	180
Hippolytus of Portus, .	200

SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA.

Pantænus, ...	180
Clement, ...	190
Origen, ...	202
Heraclas, ...	248
Dionysius, ...	265
Gregory Thaumaturgus, .	270
Pamphilus of Cæsarea, . .	309

GREEK FATHERS, NICENE AGE.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, .	270–340
Athanasius of Alexandria,	303–373
Basil the Great, . .	329–379
Cyril of Jerusalem, . .	310–386
Gregory of Nazianzum, .	330–391
Gregory of Nyssa, . .	335–395
Didymus of Alexandria, .	309–395
Epiphanius of Salamis, .	315–403
Chrysostom of Constantinople, ...	347–407
Cyril of Alexandria, .	380–444

Greek Historians after Eusebius.

Socrates of Constantinople,	380–439
Theodoret of Cyrus in Syria,	390–457
Sozomen of Constantinople,	390–423

Evagrius of Antioch, .	536–594
Theodorus, *Lector. Const.*, *fl.*	525

LATIN FATHERS, CONTEMPORARY.

Hilary of Poitiers, . .	290–368
[Ephræm the Syrian, .	300–379]
Ambrose of Milan, . .	340–397
Jerome of Rome, . .	340–419
Augustine of Hippo, .	354–430

Latin Historians after Jerome.

Ruffinus of Aquileia, .	330–410
Paulus Orosius, . . .	415
Sulpicius Severus, . . .	420
Gennadius of Gaul, . .	495
Cassiodorus, ...	562

The Study of the Early Chapters of Genesis.

By the Rev. Professor J. Rawson Lumby, D.D., Cambridge.

In studying the early chapters of Genesis there are one or two features in the character of the book which ought to be kept steadily in mind.

(1) In the early religious books of other nations, besides the Jews, we find at the outset, as in Genesis, an account of the origin of the world, but combined therewith there is nearly always found an account of the origin of the gods. Even in that Chaldæan legend, which in some of its details comes very near to the Old Testament record, we read: "There were made also the great gods, the gods Lahmu and Lahamu they caused to come" (Smith's *Chaldæan Genesis*, p. 63). In Genesis there is a cosmogony, but there is no theogony. The voice of the Eternal pre-existent Jehovah, whose name is ever "I am," calls into existence heaven and earth, and all things both visible and invisible. "He spake the word, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created."

(2) The way in which the word *Elohim* is used in the Bible as a name of God appears to be partly after the manner of a concession, partly in the way of a protest. It is a plural noun. But a plural pre-supposes the existence of a singular. *El* and *Eloah* must have preceded *Elohim*. The heathen people used this name (compare *Lahmu* and *Lahamu* above), or something akin to it, to designate those various powers of nature to which they paid their devotions. Collectively they were Elohim, gods; and the Bible uses the word frequently of the heathen deities. But it also employs it as the earliest name for the true God. As though it were admitted that in those natural powers, which the nations deified, God was revealing Himself in many ways, if men would but feel after Him and find Him. He might, therefore, without error, be called by this comprehensive title. But as a protest against the idea of many gods, Scripture joins with the plural noun a verb in the singular; thus laying stress on the prime article of the Jewish creed, "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah is one" (Deut. vi. 4). And it is of deep interest to notice, in this connexion, that when in these early biblical records we come upon one who has preserved somewhat of primitive revelation, we find the name of God in the singular number. Melchizedek is the priest of *El Elyon* (Gen. xiv. 18).

(3) If we approach these primitive documents, regarding them as anything else but poetry, we run counter to all that history teaches us concerning the first writings of other nations. The early literature of every people, and especially that which relates to the things they hold sacred, has constantly assumed a poetic form. And Genesis is such an early lesson book of the Jewish race, conveying in pictures and figures all that at first they were able to comprehend of Divine truth. To ask for numerical precision or scientific statement in such a record, is to ask for what would be foreign to its character. In allegory, God has constantly made Himself known, specially in the early ages of the world, using such terms for His revelation as the children of men at various times could best grasp and profit by. There is always, no doubt, much behind the allegory. This is the constant idea of the New Testament writers. There is something in all Scripture which needs to be laid bare. Διανόιγειν is their frequent word, to lay thoroughly open. A work which could only be perfectly done after Christ had come. This Paul did (Acts xvii. 3) for the Jews at Thessalonica, who had not yet found the full meaning of the Divine Word. This Christ Himself did (Luke xxiv. 32) for His disciples till their hearts became aglow with the new warmth and radiance shed upon the ancient Writings. And in His words to Nathanael (John i. 51), Christ gives us an instance (and there are many more in the Gospels and Epistles) how under the Old Testament story there lay hidden a significance which constituted its grandest teaching. The vision of the angels ascending and descending on Jacob, in whom at the moment was contained the whole future race of Israel, gave encouragement and comfort to the Patriarch; but it is when our Lord applies the words to Himself, in whom the whole human family is to become one man (Gal. iii. 28), that the picture of Genesis receives and gives back its true significance. If we seek for lessons of this nature in the early chapters of Genesis, they will yield us a rich reward, and the criticisms which would turn the poetry of the Divine revelation into arithmetical or geological prose will be estimated at their true value.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

REPORT.

THE greater number of papers received this time are expository. Only two theological and two literary are to hand. This is not unexpected, and we take it as a guide for the future. No doubt the most pressing as well as the most profitable work is direct exposition. We have put the theological and the literary papers together into one report, but have separated the papers of New Testament exposition into two. Several correspondents have written to say that the difficulty and magnitude of the subjects proposed have prevented them from sharing in the benefits of the Guild. We have therefore made our new scheme (which will be found on p. 70) more comprehensive.

OLD TESTAMENT EXPOSITION.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, M.A.

I have marked the papers on Psalm viii., I. II. III. IV. V. Of these No. I. (the Rev. D. Burns, Nithsdale U.P. Church, Glasgow) is clearly the best. The style shows literary ability, but is a little too florid, and would be improved by self-restraint. The paper would be more of an exposition if the writer had shown how he gets his exposition from the text. II. (S. J. B.) and III. (J. S.) are also florid in style, especially II.; and their tendency is rather to express the ideas suggested by the Psalm to the writers than to explain and set forth the meaning of the Psalm—hence a measure of irrelevance.

IV. (J. T.) and V. (J. M. S.) err in the opposite direction. V., though good as far as it goes, is much too slight, and neither explains details nor brings out fully the general meaning. IV. shows careful thought and work, but is only a series of disconnected notes on separate phrases.

There is good material in all the papers, and with study and practice the writers may make it much more difficult in future for examiners to decide between the various competitors.

NEW TESTAMENT EXPOSITION.

I.

HISTORY AND VALUE OF THE TITLE, "SON OF MAN."

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR MARSHALL RANDLES.

1. Ὅμικρον grasps the kernel of the question, and handles it well, leaning rather heavily on quotations from Bruce, M'Laren, Neander, and others. He presents clearly, as do the two others, the oneness of Christ with all humanity—the Man, the ideal Man, the Representative Man, gathering up in Himself the whole of humanity. "The religion of the New Testament, having the Son of Man for its centre, has also all the sons of men for its circumference" is a figure of speech not to be too closely criticised. The hortative element in this paper is of high tone, but possibly more than the question called for.

2. R. G. writes a lucid, pertinent, and effective paper. Beza's notion that the title is but a periphrasis of the pronoun "I" is conclusively refuted. Equally well does he dispose of Hitzig's contention that in Dan. viii. the title only refers to "the holy people of God collectively," or "the elect of the people of Israel who realise the true ideal of the kingdom of God." The writer thinks the title was an *incognito*. It may at least be said its meaning was not at first apprehended by the people, but unfolded itself as the work of the Divine-human Person proceeded.

3. J. S. C. spends some time on the Hebrew idiom "son of." He puts the thought admirably that Psalm viii. may be in some sense Messianic, but that the phrase "Son of Man" is not certainly intended as a title of the Messiah, Hebrews ii. notwithstanding. In Dan. vii. 13 he sees, I think rightly, "not, indeed, any indication of a recognised name of the Messiah as yet, but an interesting and important step towards the specialisation of the term 'Son of Man' as a title of Christ." This paper is the most, as ὅμικρον is the least, original of the three. This, in point of general excellence, must be their comparative rank, R. G. being a very good second. J. S. C. does not weave his paper out of the concordances and extracts from the best known exegetes; but reasons and judges for himself, though not differing widely in his conclusions, reminding one of an old tutor who, after hearing a sermon made up of the various opinions of commentators, advised the preacher to have an opinion of his own. J. S. C. is the Rev. J. S. Clemens, B.A., Mirfield.

II.

EXPOSITIONS OF HEBREWS XII. 1, 2.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR R. WADDY MOSS.

1. Exposition by J. R. (The Rev. John Rutherfurd, M.A., 6 Crichton Road, Rothesay).—The exposition is, especially in the case of the earlier clauses, very minute and thorough; and a careful study has been made of most of the words, and of many of the suggested interpretations. In regard to the latter clauses, such matters as the significant change of tense and the omission of the article before σταυρόν called for comment, though it is evident from the amended rendering that they had not escaped the writer's notice. The application which is intermingled with the exposition is both appropriate and forcible, as are also the supplementary lessons drawn from the passage, with the exception, perhaps, of the first. On all grounds—of accuracy, fulness, and practical use—this paper must stand at the head of the three.

Exposition by M. J. B.—This is a good specimen, somewhat too rhetorical, of the expository sermon. One or two of the collocations of words or phrases are unusual, but the style is on the whole clear and not without force. The application is natural, and generally kept within the sphere of the actual suggestiveness of the passage. But it cannot be said that all the particulars are noted which would find place in a careful and exact study. To the last phrase, for

instance, but a single sentence is devoted; and that, if sufficient for a discourse, is hardly so for an exposition.

3. Exposition by B. N. G.—This is a discourse in which the application abounds almost to the exclusion of exposition. With a little more care in the use of figures and figurative speech it would be effective in many pulpits. The tone is earnest, and the appeals to experience are direct and close.

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY.

A paper is received on "Clement of Rome" (A. S.), and one on "The Work of the Holy Spirit on Christ" (M. J. B.). The former is full and interesting, and in scholarship quite up to date. But it is hurriedly written, and would require a good deal of overhauling to prepare it for the press. The latter is most carefully written, in a fine spirit and with true insight. Its defect is the rush at the close, not due to carelessness, but to want of space.

The two literary papers are reviews of "Lux Mundi," the one (W. D. R.) of the whole book, the other (T. N.) a more elaborate criticism of Mr. Gore's essay alone. In the latter there is evidence of careful reading and capacity to handle the subject chosen, but the style is somewhat slow and pointless. The best paper of the four is by W. D. R.—the Rev. W. Douglass Reid, M.A., Clapton Presbyterian Church, London.

Will Mr. Burns, Mr. Clemens, Mr. Rutherfurd, and Mr. Reid kindly let the publishers know which of the following volumes they wish sent to them:—

Dorner's System of Christian Ethics, 14s.
Lichtenberger's History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, 14s.
Orelli's Prophecies of Isaiah, 10s. 6d.
Orelli's Prophecies of Jeremiah, 10s. 6d.
Stählin's Kant, Lotze, and Ritschl, 9s.
Workman's Text of Jeremiah, 9s.
Cassel's Commentary on Esther, 10s. 6d.
Frank's Christian Certainty, 10s. 6d.
Sartorius's Doctrine of Divine Love, 10s. 6d.

Note on ψυχή and ζωή

AND THEIR ENGLISH RENDERINGS IN AUTHORISED VERSION AND REVISED VERSION.

By the Rev. Principal J. B. M'Clellan, M.A., Cirencester.

The "Notes of Recent Exposition" are, I have no doubt, of great interest and convenience to the readers of The Expository Times. In the September issue, on p. 268, there is a reference to an article by the Rev. C. W. Darling in the *Clergyman's Magazine* for August on the difference between the two Greek words ψυχή and ζωή, and their renderings in the A.V. and R.V. Mr. Darling's statements and arguments are briefly reproduced, with the cautious and suggestive addition, "There are five passages which create a little difficulty. . . . We do not think that Mr. Darling has successfully disposed of them all." Mr. Darling's view being, to quote The Expository Times' *resumé*, that "the two words are not only distinct, but in their distinction lies a whole theology: ψυχή means our *present temporal life*, ζωή the *eternal life*;" and that while "the A.V. sometimes offers *soul* as a translation of ψυχή, but with no gain and some loss, the Revisers uniformly render both by *life*."

Now, assuming that The Expository Times has correctly reproduced Mr. Darling's view, it is desirable to utter a warning against its acceptance. With the exception of the statement that "the two words are distinct," the representations and assertions are not only not correct, but are entirely erroneous. It is not even true that "the Revisers uniformly render both words by *life*," as will be seen by referring to Luke xii. 19, 20 (R.V.), "*Soul* thou hast much goods," etc. . . . "this night is thy *soul* required of thee" (ψυχή in both cases). But the main and fundamental error is the utter misconception of the distinction between ψυχή and ζωή, as one between *life temporal* and *life eternal*. If ζωή itself were *life eternal*, then the constantly recurring phrase ζωή αἰώνιος would be needless. There is, certainly, a real and great distinction between the two words; but neither in one nor the other is the idea of *temporal* or *eternal* involved. Whether the one or the other refers to *eternal life* in any particular passage, or otherwise, must be judged by the context and by the phraseology employed. That, contrary to Mr. Darling, ζωή undoubtedly *is* used at times of life *temporal*, is clear from James iv. 14 ("What is your ζωή, a vapour," etc.); and that ψυχή may at times *seem* to be rendered correctly by *life*, is no more a proof that the word means *life temporal*, or *life* at all, than that *caput* means *death* because *damnari capitis* is rightly rendered in English by "*condemned to death*." It is purely an accident of *phrase* and *idiom*, and translators, whether in A.V. or R.V., are right or wrong according as they pay the proper attention to the *context* and the *idiom*, and render accordingly. That the R.V. generally falls far below our venerable A.V. in its renderings, I, for one, believe to be capable of demonstration

in every book of the New Testament;[1] but at all events it has not so far fallen as to be guilty of rendering ψυχή by *life* in Luke xii. 19, above cited, or, again, in such passages as Matthew x. 28 ("not able to kill the *soul*," etc.). The fact is, that a comparison between ψυχή and ζωή is almost like a comparison between *eye* and *sight*, or between *matter* and *energy*; and the difference between the words is simply this, that ψυχή, *soul*, is the *organism* or *substance* in which ζωή, *life*, partly resides as a *state* or *activity* which may be either *temporal* or *eternal* according to circumstances, and may be predicated (as frequently) not only of *man*, but also of the *lower animals* and even of *plants*. Ψυχή, *soul*, is thus the antithesis to σῶμα, *body*, (as in Matthew x. 28; also in vi. 25, where it is to be regretted that the rendering *soul* is inadmissible according to usage), the loss of point being considerable in consequence,[2] as ζωή, *life*, is to θάνατος, *death*. The application to *temporal* or *eternal* conditions is not in the words themselves, but in the phrases and arguments of the writer; and when the true distinction between the words is recognised, no difficulty can arise either in any of the passages referred to by THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, or in any other. The phrases and contexts explain the meaning, and to all who are familiar with the idioms of the two languages will suggest the correct or most practicable English equivalent, *viz.*, for ζωή, *life*, always, whether *temporal* or *eternal*; for ψυχή, *soul* or *life*, according to requirement. In such cases as Luke xvi. 25, and 1 Cor. xv. 19, where the reference is to *temporal life*, the employment of ψυχή would be absolutely impossible, whereas ζωή is correct: and, on the other hand, in such passages as Matthew xvi. 25, and Acts ii. 27 ("*Whosoever shall lose his* ψυχή *for my sake shall find* IT;" and "*He will not leave my* ψυχή *in Hades*"), where ψυχή *is* correctly employed, to assign the reference to *temporal life* would be to reduce the statements to absurdity.

Furthermore (and with this remark I must bring this note to a close), even in the famous and often expounded passage, Matthew xvi. 26, "*What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own* ψυχήν" (A.V., *soul*; R.V., *life*), it is evident from a comparison with the parallel in Luke ix. 25 ("*lose* HIMSELF"), and with Matthew x. 28 ("*Who is able to destroy both body and* SOUL *in Gehenna*"), that the R.V. change of *soul* into *life*, however acceptable on some grounds, is (through the idiomatic usage) not unattended by grave loss of force and of designed spiritual application; and that preachers, if not translators, may still wisely prefer the less sacrifice of meaning to the greater, and still urge the inquiry in the time-honoured form, "*What shall a man give in exchange for his* SOUL?" The ψυχή, *soul*, of the Christ, which was "*not left in Hades*" (Acts ii. 27), *this* it is which was given as the ransom (Matt. xx. 28).

Ζωή and ψυχή in the New Testament.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR W. T. DAVISON, M.A.

From "Biblical and Literary Notes," in the Methodist Recorder, 16th October 1890.

A MINISTERIAL correspondent asks whether the distinction that has been drawn between two Greek words *zoé* and *psyché* (ζωή and ψυχή), both translated "life," in the New Testament is tenable. An allusion to this distinction is found in an interesting note in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September, where it is said "ψυχή means our present temporal life, ζωή the eternal life." Thus it is said of our Saviour, "The Son of man came to give His life (ψυχή, His human, temporal life) a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28), but "I am the resurrection and the life" (ζωή, the divine, the eternal life) (John xi. 25). Our correspondent doubts whether this distinction can be upheld, and suggests that "ψυχή refers to the principle of natural life, ζωή to the duration of life, either natural, spiritual, or eternal."

We think there can be no doubt that the distinction above referred to is amply sustained by New Testament usage. It is not new; the writer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES merely points out some interesting results of observing the distinction as indicated by another writer, the Rev. C. W. Darling. Ζωή occurs about 150 times (roughly speaking) in the New Testament, and only in some eight or ten of these does it denote the earthly life of the individual or existence in the present state; and even of these instances, some are doubtful. In other passages it denotes that which is "life indeed" (1 Tim. vi. 19, Revised

[1] In the *Theological Monthly* for September last, Dr. Weymouth has most brilliantly and thoroughly exposed the *Revisers'* ignorance or neglect of the real force of Greek and English tenses, which mars their whole work. But even this is not the chief of their "disappointing and deplorable" results.

[2] Anxiety for the ψυχή, *soul*, is not forbidden, save as to *eating* and *drinking*; anxiety for the σῶμα, *body*, not forbidden, save as to *raiment*. For "*the* SOUL *is more than food*," etc.

Version). Indicating in itself that which is the complete antithesis to death, the word lends itself easily in the New Testament, as Trench pointed out long ago, to that true life which alone triumphs over death, physical and spiritual. "No wonder, then, that Scripture should know of no higher word than this to set forth the blessedness of God and the blessedness of the creature in communion with God." In this general signification, ζωή is used with a variety of shades of meaning. Sometimes it refers to the future state only, sometimes to the whole sum of blessed life in God here and hereafter. In St. Paul it often describes the sum of the Divine promises in the gospel; St. John uses it with a stately significance characteristic of his style as that which primarily and essentially belongs to God alone, but which becomes man's possession through the self-revelation of the Father in the Son.

Our correspondent is, however, right in assuming that ζωή had not originally this meaning, and does not always preserve it in the New Testament. As the antithesis of *thanatos* (θάνατος), death, it does sometimes refer to our natural life in the present state. See Acts xvii. 25, "He giveth to all *life* and breath and all things;" 1 Cor. xv. 19, "In this *life* only;" Luke xvi. 25, "Thou in thy *life*-time receivedst thy good things;" Jas. iv. 14, "For what is your *life?* It is even a vapour." The passage Rom. viii. 38 also should probably be understood in this connection, "For I am persuaded that neither death nor *life*," etc.; compare 1 Cor. iii. 32, "The world, or *life*, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours." It is true that the able writer in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES judges otherwise. He says, "It is not this present life St. Paul takes notice of, it is the life beyond; not even in death, not even in the life beyond death, the life eternal, will he be separated from the love of Christ." We venture to think this a mistake. The antithesis points in quite a different direction, and if ζωή be here used of that higher spiritual life which transcends our present state of mortality and corruption, it cannot be conceived of as that which would separate us from Christ.

The presence of these very few passages, however, cannot hide from us the fact that in the New Testament the word ζωή has been ennobled. If we might so paraphrase the scriptural expression of 2 Cor. v. 4, that which is mortal in it has been swallowed up of higher life. On the other hand, ψυχή is, as our correspondent puts it, essentially the principle of natural life. It is used in the New Testament nearly always of the life of man, and mainly of his individual existence. The translation "soul," appropriate in some respects, is often misleading, because we speak of "saving the soul" in contradistinction to preservation of the mere life of the body. There can be no question that the Revisers give our Lord's meaning more correctly in passages such as Matt. xvi. 26, "What shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his *life?*" The saving of the *life* (not "soul") in verse 25 points only to our present state of existence, the true meaning of which can only be realised, and its true end attained, by our renouncing self and serving Christ. But the subject is a large one, beyond the scope of these brief notes. We have referred to it thus far because it is suggestive, and may be followed up by readers for themselves. Those who do not read Greek will find all the help they require in Young's *Concordance*.

The Sunday School.

Exposition of the International Lessons.

I.

November 30.—Luke xxiv. 1-12.

Jesus Risen.

This is both a short and an unusually easy lesson. No doubt there may be found difficulties enough in harmonising the different narratives of the resurrection. But of all barren things to discuss in the Sunday School supposed discrepancies in the Gospels is the most barren and fruitless. When a critic of Archdeacon Farrar's capacity and freedom (witness for *freedom* his recent book on the *Minor Prophets*) holds that there are *no* discrepancies, most teachers will be content.

Following St. Luke's narrative, then, we receive a clear and most interesting impression of the earliest events of this first Lord's Day.

It was very early in the morning when Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, Salome, and other women came to the sepulchre in Joseph's garden to anoint with spices the body of Jesus. Discussing as they came what they should do about the great stone which closed the entrance of the sepulchre, they were surprised, on arriving, to find it rolled away. But this was nothing to the surprise they got when they entered the tomb, for they "found not the body" there.

This is the first great fact in any proof of the resurrection of Jesus; and it is the more valuable that, as Dr. Farrar notices, it is admitted as a fact by the most rationalistic critics, the most advanced sceptics. The body of Jesus was gone from the sepulchre. The most ingenious theories have been

devised to account for it; and, it must also be said, the most absurd. There could be no better illustration than we have here of the wisdom of letting one sceptic answer another; for the first thing that each new theorist does, before stating his own theory of how the body could be gone without admitting a resurrection, is to demolish the theory of his predecessor.

The first thought of the women was of the loss they had sustained. Some one had removed, perhaps stolen away, the body. Then the angels appeared. It was a time of much moment for angels as well as men, and heaven and earth had got very close together. "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" The sepulchre is the place of the dead. Jesus has a divine life which cannot die. He is not merely alive, He is always living. The angels do not merely state the fact that He is alive from the dead, but that it was not possible He could be holden of the grave.

"Remember how He spake unto you." Thus the angels began the office which is specially that of the Spirit—they brought things to remembrance, whatsoever Jesus had said. And no doubt with a power of conviction which the Spirit only possesses, which human words cannot have; so that, though the women were convinced, they could not convince the disciples.

But Peter—readier, opener, and perhaps only more impulsive—arose and ran unto the sepulchre, whereupon we have an important addition made to the proof of the resurrection. The linen cloths were carefully laid by themselves. This removal of the body was not the work of a hasty friend or terrified foe. Everything has been done decently and in order. He that believeth does not make haste. He that is the object of faith does nothing to require it.

II.

December 7.—Luke xxiv. 13–27.

The Walk to Emmaus.

1. "Two of them." The name of the one was Cleopas (ver. 18), the name of the other we know not. They were disciples, but not of the eleven Apostles.

2. "Three score furlongs." Six and a half miles.

3. "O fools" (ver. 25). The expression in the original is not nearly so strong as this. "Ye foolish ones" might do.

4. "Ought not Christ to have suffered." Put the emphasis on "ought." Christ *had* to fulfil the prophets, who prophesied that he would suffer and rise again.

5. "Beginning at Moses." The earliest promise and prophecy is Genesis iii. 15.

This incident occurred on the same day as our Lord had risen. Thus it was one of the earliest of his manifestations. We cannot but wonder, therefore, at the grace of it. Who were these two so highly favoured? We know nothing about them beyond the single item that the name of one of them was Cleopas. There had not occurred an event so momentous as this in the whole history of Israel, but the angels are not sent to make the announcement to the High Priest, nor does Jesus Himself appear first to the reigning monarch. Two men had the heart to miss Him, the wondering hope of again finding Him, and that was enough. As they walked, "Jesus Himself drew near and went with them."

We recognise thus that He is the same Jesus. There are signs of a difference in His bodily appearance. The eyes of these two were holden that they did not recognise Him. Neither did Mary Magdalene recognise Him, nor the disciples on the lake. But whatever change may have taken place in His body, we see that He is Himself unchanged. He is the same who made the fishermen His friends, and ate with publicans and sinners.

Still is He the same in heaven. We wonder how He had time to attend to these two ignorant, unknown men. We wonder still, can He attend to us? Let us not forget that after His ascension to heaven, He found time to meet another traveller by the way, a traveller in no ways greatly distinguished then—Saul the Pharisee, as he journeyed to Damascus—

> "Though now ascended up on high,
> He bends on earth a brother's eye."

But notice, as a further lesson, the way He led the two to know Him. He did not disdain evidences, but they were the very simplest. He ran over the prophecies of His death and resurrection and final glory, as the books of the Old Testament contain them. For how shall we believe except we hear? Then when they knew the truth about Him, He opened their eyes, and they knew Himself. It was the sight of Himself that converted them.

III.

December 14.—Luke xxiv. 28–43.

Jesus made known.

He made Himself known (1) to the two who went to Emmaus, (2) to Simon, (3) to the Apostles and others. These are the three appearings recorded in this lesson.

(1) To the two disciples who went to Emmaus. Already we have followed their walk till they arrived at the village. Jesus made as if He would have gone further, but they pressed Him to stay. They did not know it was their Lord; but His voice was strangely familiar, and His words were powerful to search the conscience, so that their hearts burned within them. They would hear more, and at their entreaty He stayed, for already He is the *hearer of prayer*. Then, "as He sat at meat with them, He took bread and blessed, and brake and gave to them: and their eyes were opened and they knew Him, and He vanished out of their sight." *It is like a celebration of the Lord's Supper.* The Word is preached, and preached in its direct bearing upon the Supper, the text being the *necessity* of His suffering. There is also the breaking of the bread, the blessing, and the distribution. But one most significant thing must be observed. The blessing does not *bring* His bodily presence, neither does the faith of the men; rather it is just then when He had blessed, and when their eyes were opened that they knew Him, that "He vanished out of their sight." To partake of His body and blood, all we need is His presence in the Spirit.

(2) To Simon. St. Paul mentions this appearance also (1 Cor. xv. 5), but we know nothing of the details of it. We can only remember that Simon had shown a readiness to listen to the words of the women (ver. 12). We can believe that, notwithstanding the great denial, he understood Jesus as well as any, and was as prepared to know of His resurrection. And, lastly, we can easily admit the likelihood that the forgiving Lord would seek an early opportunity of comforting the forgiven Apostle.

(3) To the Apostles. As they were wondering at the words of the two disciples who had returned from Emmaus, "Jesus Himself stood in the midst." They were gathered within closed doors for fear of the Jews (John xx. 19.) Here we must notice (1) the apparent change in the risen body, and (2) the reality of that body. It is impossible to enter upon a discussion of this most mysterious subject. But it is well to draw attention, in the light of St. Paul's words that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," to the evident intimations here that Jesus did now act in a way which was unfamiliar to the disciples. He vanished out of their sight; He suddenly appeared in their midst, the doors being shut; and they thought He was a spirit. Yet (2) His body was real. "Handle me," He said; and He ate food before them. So that in later days these proofs of His actual bodily resurrection were among the strongest to which the Apostles could appeal. Says St. John in his first epistle (i. 1), "Which . . . our hands have *handled* of the Word of Life;" says St. Peter, "God . . . showed Him openly . . . to us, who did *eat and drink with Him* after He rose from the dead" (Acts x. 41).

IV.

December 21.—Luke xxiv. 44–53.

Jesus' Parting Words.

In His parting words to the disciples, He began at the beginning of the Old Testament and went through it, tracing the prophecies which related to Himself, just as He had done to the two on the way to Emmaus. We cannot insist upon it that He quoted from every book in the Old Testament, but the words used here—"the law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms"—include the Old Testament as a whole, just as we have it now. He traced *Himself* throughout it; for He is not only the key to open the meaning of every book, but the link which binds the one book to the other, first in the old Testament, then in the New, and, finally, the two Testaments together. Says the old commentator:—

"In Vetere Testamento Novum latet,
In Novo Testamento Vetus patet."

"In the Old Testament the New is concealed,
In the New Testament the Old is revealed."

And this is the reason why.

He appealed to what they knew, to that authority which they admitted—the Scriptures of the Old Testament. In every one of us, in the youngest child, there is something to appeal to, and to build out from that is the only true education. St. Paul had sometimes only the conscience—the crude, covered conscience of a heathen—to which to make his appeal. How much more have we!

He made the "doing" follow upon the "doctrine," the hand upon the head. Understanding the Scriptures, they must preach.

But here we come upon the great matter and mystery of the lesson. "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued (literally, *clothed upon*) with power from on high." The hand must follow the head; knowing the doctrine, we must do it; but between the two there must come the enduement. What does it mean to the children? These simple truths may be mentioned and easily illustrated.

1. We can do nothing for God until we know His will. The Bible contains His will.

2. We may know the Bible well, but we must *understand* it.

3. It is God who opens the understanding. We must read with prayer.

4. To know is to serve. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye *do* them."

5. But the most active service may do no good. God's presence is needed in the Spirit, and we may have to wait a long time before we are conscious of His presence and help.

6. God does not *need* our work. It is the greatest of all lessons to learn that He can do without us.

Life's Phases.

By the Rev. James Stark, Belmont Street Congregational Church, Aberdeen. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier. 1890. 2s. 6d.

The Scotch Evangelical pulpit has no better all-round representative than Mr. Stark, and this book is worthy of him. Strong, sensible, well-digested thought, healthy and brotherly sympathy, an eye wide-awake to the signs of the times, a genial and cultured style, brightened with illustrations and allusions which show the catholicity of the preacher's reading,—these, together with outspoken loyalty to the old central truths, are the marks which Mr. Stark's admirers will look for, and which they will find. Some may think the concatination of "Phases" a little arbitrary, and the title itself rather indefinite and commonplace; but there is so much point and power in the substance of this little volume that we do not care to find fault with the form.

William A. Gray.

Index to Modern Sermons and Expositions.

MATTHEW.

i. 18–ii. 22.—Ewald (H.), Old and New Testament Theology, 315.

i. 18–ii. 23.—Caspari (C. E.), Introduction to Life of Christ, 61.

i. 19.—Cremer (H.), Biblico-Theological Lexicon, 189.
Ewald (H.), Old and New Test. Theol., 244.
Farrar (F. W.), Early Days of Christianity, i. 514.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 54.

i. 20.—Andrews (S. J.), Life of our Lord, 50.
Ashley (J. M.), Year with Great Preachers, 38.
Barrett (A. C.), Companion to Greek N. T., 36.
Beck (J. T.), Biblical Psychology, 114.
Ewald (H.), Old and New Test. Theol., 327.
Green (T. S.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 81.
Nicholson (E. B.), Our New New Test., 26.
Scrivener (F. H.), Notes on St. Matthew, 133.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 57.

i. 20.—Stier (R.), Words of the Angels, 37.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 224, 228, 230.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 487, 500.

i. 21.—Brooks (G.), Outlines of Sermons, 9.
Brooks (Phillips), Lectures on Preaching, 274.
Butler (W. J.), Sermons for Working Men, 35.
Ewald (H.), History of Israel, vi. 132.
Hannam (T.), Pulpit Assistant, iii. 242.
Huntington (G.), Sermons for Holy Seasons, ii. 45.
Jay (W.), Short Discourses, i. 243.
Kennedy (J.), Sermons at Dingwall, 31.
Kingsley (C.), Sermons for the Times, 42.
Magee (W. C.), Sermons (Cont. Pul. Lib.), i. 39.
Sanday (W.), Gospels in the Second Century, 91, 104.
Skeffington (S. W.), Our Sins or our Saviour, 48.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 60.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Morning by Morning, 39.
,, Evening by Evening, 39.
,, Sermons, xxiv., No. 1434.
Sturrock (J. B.), Our Present Hope, 163.
Symington (G.), Doctrine of the Atonement, 316.
Wace (H.), Gospel and its Witnesses, 68.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 68, 225, 256.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of New Test. Greek, 187.
Christian World Pulpit, vii. 376 (Landels).
,, xxxi. 65 (Bradley).
Church of Eng. Mag., lviii. 240 (Simpson).
Clergyman's Magazine, i. 345.
Clerical Lib. : Outlines on the New Test., 1.
Contemporary Pulpit, x. 372 (Rogers).
Homiletical Library, i. 291.
Homiletic Quarterly, iv. 259 (Spurgeon).
Homilist, xlv. 413 (Bennet) ; liii. 404 (Thomas).
Penny Pulpit, No. 1566 (Finney).

i. 21–23.—Church of England Mag., liii. 273 (Dalton).
Homilist, xxiii. 52.

i. 22.—Keble (J.), Sermons for the Christian Year, Christmas and Epiphany, 160.
Lange (J. P.), Life of Christ, i. 364.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Revision of the N. T., 90, 91, 121.
M'Clellan (J. B.), Four Gospels, 624.
Nicholson (E. B.), Our New New Test., 27.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 226, 228.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of New Test. Greek, 576.
Clerical Lib. : Outlines on the N. T., 2.

MATTHEW.

i. 22, 23.—Jones (J. C.), Studies in St. Matthew, 1.
Liddon (H. P.), Sermons from the Penny Pulpit, iii. No. 1086 ; Christmastide in St. Paul's, 89.
Weiss (B.), Biblical Theology of the New Testament, ii. 299.
Christian World Pulpit, xv. 1 (Liddon).
Clerical Lib.: Expos. Outlines on the New Test., 1 (Liddon).

i. 23.—Contemporary Pulpit, 2nd Series, ii. 368 (Jones).
Barrett (A. C.), Companion to the Greek N. T., 37, 143.
Boyd (A. K. H.), Graver Thoughts, iii. 169
Brooks (G.), Outlines of Sermons, 9.
Hannam (T), Pulpit Assistant, iii. 242
Horton (R. F.), Inspiration and the Bible, 105.
Huntington (G.), Sermons for the Church's Seasons, Advent to Trinity, 15.
Hutton (H.), Sermons on the Lord's Prayer, 235.
Keble (J.), Sermons for the Christian Year, ii. 160.
Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, i. 80.
Plumptre (C. E.), Biblical Studies, 45.
Pusey (E. B.), Sermons, 47.
,, Sermons for Church's Seasons, 54.
Salmon (G.), Introduction to the New Testament, 81, 199.
Sanday (W.), Gospels in the Second Century, 92.
Scrivener (F. H.), Notes on St. Matthew, 133.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 150.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, xxi., No. 1270.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 67.
Wilmot-Buxton, H. J., Life of Duty, i. 39.
Wright (A.), Composition of the Gospels, 105.
Christian Herald, 1889, Part II.; 1890, Part I.
Christian Leader, 1890, ix. 526.
Christian World Pulpit, xiv. 107 (Wonnacott).
Contemporary Pulpit, 1st Series, vi. 119.
Homiletical Library, i. 293, 294.
Homilist, liii. 375 (Preece).
Presbyterian Review, 1888, ix. 34.
Sermon Bible, v. 314.
Sunday Magazine, 1878, 122 (Raleigh).

i. 24.—Barrett (A. C.), Companion to Greek New Test., 36.
Edersheim (A.), Jesus the Messiah, i. 251.
Green (T. S.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 12.
Hammond (C. E.), Textual Criticism of New Test., 64.
Keble (J.), Sermons for the Christian Year, ii. 149.
Plain Sermons by Contributors to the Tracts for the Times, viii. 285.
Sermon Bible, v. 5.

i. 24, 25.—M'Clellan (J. B.), Four Gospels, 541.

i. 25.—Bleek (F.), Introduction to the New Testament, ii. 139.
Edersheim (A.), Jesus the Messiah, i. 180.
Gilfillan (G.), Alpha and Omega, ii. 270.
Keble (J.), Sermons for the Christian Year, ii. 180.
M'Clellan (J. B.), Four Gospels, 379, 625.
Neander (A.), Life of Christ, 32.
Scrivener (F. H.), Notes on St. Matthew, 134.
Weiss (B.), Life of Christ, i. 229, 281.
Westcott and Hort, Greek Test., ii., Appendix, 8.
Expositor, 2nd Series, ii. 198 (Wace).

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

NEW DEPARTURE.

BEFORE stating our proposals for a new departure, let us thank the men who have contributed papers under our first scheme. We are perfectly well aware that the trifling inducement offered would of itself have been insufficient to draw out these papers, had not good-will towards the effort we were making to promote earnest Biblical study been the controlling motive. We hope that that good-will may still be on our side, but raised to higher power through increase in the numbers sharing it.

Another prefatory word of thanks is due to the many who communicated with us, at our invitation, anent the Book of Scripture to be studied. The valuable hints which have been sent regarding books and writers are already being acted upon. But as regards the special Book of the Bible for study, our correspondents will understand that, if the wishes of all were granted, we should commence at once with six in the Old Testament and ten in the New. The six Books chosen in the Old Testament are Genesis, Deuteronomy, 1 Samuel, Job, Psalms, and Isaiah, to which "the Minor Prophets" must be added. In the New, Matthew, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Hebrews, 1 John, and Revelation—with a decided preference for Romans and Ephesians.

We have resolved to choose for systematic study—

GENESIS in the Old Testament (the early chapters), and EPHESIANS in the New Testament.

We invite our readers—so many of them as discover the need and the opportunity—to study with us either of these Books or both of them. In the issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1891, two sets of examination papers will be published upon each of these books, four sets in all.

1. The first set of questions will take Dr. Dods' *Commentary on Genesis* as basis (Clark's *Handbooks for Bible Classes*, 2s. 6d.) up to page 27, *together with such papers upon the early chapters of Genesis as appear in* THE EXPOSITORY TIMES *from the present issue* (see Dr. Lumby's introductory paper) *to the issue for May*. No knowledge of Hebrew will be expected.

2. The second set of questions will take Delitzsch's *New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i. (T. & T. Clark, 10s. 6d.) as basis, to the end of p. 204, including the Introduction, and such papers as appear in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, as stated above. An elementary knowledge of Hebrew will be counted upon.

3. The third set of questions will take Moule's *Commentary on Ephesians* (*Cambridge Bible for Colleges*, 2s. 6d.) or Agar Beet's *Ephesians* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1890, 7s. 6d.), including the Introductions and Appendices, together with such papers as appear on Ephesians in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from the present to the issue for May. No knowledge of Greek will be expected.

4. The fourth set of questions will take as basis either Meyer's *Commentary on Ephesians*, with Introduction and Notes, or the same portion of Ellicott's *Commentary*. Some knowledge of Greek will be expected.

Any person may take Nos. 1 and 3, or 2 and 4, but not Nos. 1 and 2, or 3 and 4. The questions may be answered with the free use of these books and papers, or with the assistance of any other books at command. But it will be impossible to answer them well without careful *study* of the portions named.

For the best papers the Publishers will offer books of value, as formerly, those to Nos. 2 and 4 being of more value and of a higher class than those to Nos. 1 and 3.

But, in addition to these, we have proposals to make for more immediate practical work.

Books will be offered *every month*—

1. To Sunday School Teachers only, for the best Illustration (old or new) of any subject in each of the International Lessons for the next month.

2. To the Ministers and Members of some particular Church only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or an Address on any passage occurring in Genesis i.–xi.

3. To all and sundry, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Accordingly, we offer books—

1. To Sunday School Teachers only, for the best illustrations (as above) of the International Lessons for January 1891.

2. To the Clergy and Members of the Church of England only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or Address on any passage in Genesis (Chapters i.–xi.). The Notes must not occupy more than half a column of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, this type. They should be after the nature of the "Methods of Treatment" in the *Great Text Commentary*, *i.e.* readable in themselves.

3. To all, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians. No restriction as to length or manner of treatment will be made at present. The original Greek may be referred to or not as convenient.

The best papers will be published every month in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES; and when the writers see them there they may send to the Publishers for the book they select, out of a list which will be given. The number and value of the books will depend upon the success of this scheme of work. The writer's name and address should be given, but no names or initials will be published except of those whose papers are printed, and who do not express a desire to the contrary. The papers intended for January must be received by the Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B., by the 5th day of December, and so on for every succeeding month.

"One of the Malefactors."

By the Rev. W. Glynne, M.A.

In the July number of The Expository Times you quote from an article of the Rev. T. W. Knipe, M.A., a paragraph relative to the above subject.

The silence of Scripture, I take it, leaves it for human reason to infer, and I believe the probability is on the side of the accepted belief as represented by the *fresco* of Luinis.

It is no objection to say that "we must believe that one who apparently was silenced by the reproach of sin died under condemnation hard by the cross of Jesus." In the first place, the Scriptures do not justify the conclusion that he was "silenced," nor even "apparently silenced." We may infer that he was silent. There is a great difference between being *silent* and being *silenced.* But that he was silent does not prove that he was even "apparently silenced." A man may be silent to give his comrade an opportunity to retort; but that does not mean that he was "silenced," nor even "*apparently* silenced."

The conversation of the other (ὁ ἕτερος) with Jesus Christ did not give him opportunity to reply, whether he wished it or not.

Again, even if he was really "silenced by the reproach of sin," and even if that be a step towards being saved, it does not prove that he was saved, nor that he was more likely to be saved than lost. This first and negative condition was fulfilled in the case of Judas—ἥμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθῷον,—as well as in the case of Cain—"My punishment is greater than I can bear."

To the man silenced by "the reproach of sin" there are open two courses of action: either to go "out from the presence of the Lord" into "the land of Nod," as Cain did—to go out into the night (ἐξῆλθεν· ἦν δὲ νύξ), as Judas Iscariot did; or to do as the penitent thief did, "And he said, Jesus, remember me when Thou comest in thy kingdom" (R.V.). If he takes the former course, he will die "hard by the cross of Jesus;" if the latter, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (R.V.). That the "one of the malefactors" adopted one of these two courses of action the narrative does not state.

If he had adopted the latter course, if he had in any way signified that his mind was following "the other" (ὁ ἕτερος), or if Jesus Christ had read his unspoken confession, it is most probable that the fact would not be passed unnoticed.

Thus the silence of Scripture lends the weight of probability on the side of the accepted opinion. Bunyan would have been quite as correct if he had written, "Then I saw that there was a way to 'heaven' from the very gates of 'hell.'"

At the Literary Table.

Messrs. Longmans send us notice that they have in the press a translation, by Mrs. Colyer Fergusson, of Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye's **Manual of the Science of Religion,** recommended by Dr. Salmond in The Expository Times for November.

The First Three Gospels: their Origin and Relations. By J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A. (London: The Sunday School Association, 1890, 3s. 6d.) This book proceeds upon a principle which empties it of all real value as an introduction to the study of the Synoptic Gospels, and makes its undoubtedly competent scholarship of no account. We mean the determination, for so it seems to us, to find discrepancies and difficulties at every point; a proceeding which is quite as unscientific as the determination to make everything agree. In consequence, its position is well forward on the negative side. Still, it is surprising to find that it identifies faith with credulity. Whether the gospel miracles are the offspring of the credulous imagination of the early Christians, is a question which is quite open to inquiry; but to ascribe their invention to *faith* is to exhibit an incapacity for understanding the meaning of that essential word, sufficient to make any book on the Gospels useless for all good purpose.

Some editor may regret the loss of **The Old Testament Scriptures,** by Henry Harris, B.D. (London: Henry Frowde, 1890, 1s.), for we cannot but think that what would have served as an excellent magazine article has been lost by making a book of it. It is, however, printed and published in a style which few magazines could have afforded; and, since it is coming to be with books as with sermons, that you cannot have too little of them, its success may be greater than we should anticipate. It is the effort of a scholar, a clear thinker, and a clear writer, to allay the present apprehension over the inroads of criticism. In effect, Mr. Harris says there is something in the Old Testament which criticism never can touch.

Two important additions have just been made to the **Cambridge Bible for Colleges and Schools.** *Galatians* (1s. 6d.), by the Rev. E. H. Perowne, D.D., Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and *Revelations* (3s.), by the late Rev. W. H. Simcox, M.A. We shall reserve the latter. Upon the issue of *Galatians* from the pen of the Master of Corpus Christi, we are now able to associate with this series the names of three distinguished brothers. The Dean of Peterborough, the Very Rev. J. J. S. Perowne, D.D., has not yet made any direct contribution to the series, but he is engaged upon Genesis, and is the general editor. The Archdeacon of Norwich, the Ven. T. T. Perowne, D.D., has edited five of the Minor Prophets (*Obadiah and Jonah*, 2s. 6d.; *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*, 3s. 6d.). It is an easy prophecy that the Dean's *Genesis* will be "forward," compared with the work of the Archdeacon. They all exhibit the highest watermark of scholarship.

The Epistle to the Galatians offers no opportunity for the discussion of critical problems. It is true that a recent German monograph has tried to open up the long-closed controversy with a bold attack upon the Pauline authorship. But no one will blame Dr. Perowne for passing that by. The introduction is, therefore, simply an historical *résumé* of the well-known facts: the writer's strength is thrown into the exposition. Upon a crucial passage (Gal. ii. 16), we have the following characteristic note:—"'Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ'—that is, '*but only* through faith in Jesus Christ.' The rendering of the R.V., '*save* through faith,' is grammatically possible, but logically wrong; and, as a translation, not only incorrect, but misleading. The declaration of St. Paul has its counterpart in the utterance of the believing heart—

'Nothing in my hand I bring;
Simply to Thy cross I cling.'

A shipwrecked sailor was trying to save his life by swimming, employing one hand for that purpose, while with the other he clutched a bag of provisions which he had rescued from the sinking ship. When his strength was nearly exhausted, a vessel came in sight. He was descried, and a rope thrown to him. He seized it with one hand: 'Lay hold with both hands, or we cannot save you.' He let go the bag of provisions, and was hauled safely on board the friendly vessel. His life was saved *apart from* his provisions; but he found that it could not be maintained *without* them."

The correspondent who signs himself "Beta," without adding name or address, will have his doubts set at rest about Dr. Stewart's **Hebrew Grammar** if he will send 3s. 6d. to Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh. They do not say why the book is omitted in their catalogue, but the fourth edition, 1887, is still in print.

The new volume of the **Biblical Illustrator,** by the Rev. Joseph S. Exell, M.A. (Nisbet, 7s. 6d), contains Philippians and Colossians. It is impossible not to feel grateful for such a magnificent specimen of time-saving apparatus. In this comparatively cheap volume these two epistles are illustrated once for all—at least, what is done here will not need doing again in our day and generation. Probably no man living except Mr. Exell could have done it.

There is nothing strikingly original either in style or exegesis about Mr. Ross's **Lectures on the Lord's Prayer** (*Our Father's Kingdom: Lectures on the Lord's Prayer.* By the Rev. Charles B. Ross, M.A., B.D., Canada. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890, 2s. 6d.), but they are, therefore, the better adapted for their purpose. This is the book to get for clear and simple presentation of the best modern expository work on this all-important section of the Gospels.

The latest issue in Professor Marcus Dods and Dr. Alexander Whyte's **Handbooks for Bible Classes** is an exposition of the Six Intermediate Minor Prophets (*Obadiah to Zephaniah*), by Principal Douglas (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 6d.). It is in Dr. Douglas's well-known manner, of which it is an excellent example, and it can safely be recommended either for Bible Class or private work.

A new book by Dr. Matheson is one of the chiefest pleasures of the month. He calls it **Spiritual Development of St. Paul** (Blackwood & Son, Edinburgh and London, 1890, 5s.). "I intend," are the opening words, "to make an attempt to write the inner biography of Paul the Apostle. I shall try to trace the course of his spiritual history from the day of his conversion to Christianity until the day when he declared himself 'ready to be offered.' It is a task, not of great length, but of great magnitude." It is a task, we may add, demanding a most special aptitude, and only two or three persons can be named to whom, with any hope, it might be entrusted. But Dr. Matheson is one. The book has just come in; we shall review it in our next issue. But the lover of a good and helpful book may safely anticipate any review of it.

Annuals begin to claim attention. If any of them can beat Mrs. Menzies' **Our Own Gazette,** at 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d., we should be glad to see it.

Many of the monthlies have issued their programmes for 1891. **The Young Man** will commence a new and enlarged series, with papers by Dr. Parker under the title of "Well Begun," and a tale by Edward Garrett. **The Quiver** announces three new stories for the new volume, which begins with the November part, and papers by Dr. Hugh Macmillan, Prebendary Harry Jones, and many more. One of the most attractive is the programme of **The Worker's Monthly.** "The series of papers on the Egyptian Discoveries, the Sinaitic Surveys, the Discoveries in Syria and Palestine in connection with the history of the Jews, will be continued and extended to the recent finds in the country of the Hittites, and in the land beyond Jordan." That is only a part of the "Religious Pemmican" which the editor promises, "solid, but neither unpalatable nor yet undigestible."

In connection with the attention that is being given at present to the Prophets and Prophecy, readers should not miss a series of articles in **The Scottish Congregationalist** from July to October 1890. The title is "Some Aspects of Prophecy." They are written by Professor A. F. Simpson, M.A., Edinburgh. *The Scottish Congregationalist* reminds one of **The Baptist Magazine,** and that in two respects. A distinctly literary flavour is discerned in all the editor's work, and the character of most of the articles is quite above the level of the ordinary denominational magazine.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

We notice with pleasure the appointment to the Principalship of St. Aidan's of the Rev. E. Elmer Harding, M.A., at present Vice-Principal of Lichfield Theological College. Principal Harding will continue his contributions to The Expository Times.

On the other hand, it is with deep regret that we record the death of the Rev. T. G. Rooke, B.A., Principal of Rawdon Baptist College. One of the ripest Old Testament scholars, he was also, to our personal knowledge, a singularly modest man. He took a keen interest in The Expository Times from its very first number, and wrote more than once in hearty appreciation. Though his actual contribution was small, that also showed his unselfish interest, for it was sent at a time when he was too ill to do more than dictate it.

Professor Huxley is not yet done with the "Gadarene" miracle. *The Nineteenth Century* of December contains another article on the subject, under the title of "The Keepers of the Herd of Swine." For Professor Huxley is not a little exercised about the property of these "Gadarene Swinefolk;" and, notwithstanding his "longing for peace," feels "truly obliged to Mr. Gladstone for compelling me to place my case before the public once more."

But Professor Huxley makes little effort to conceal where his real interest in the miracle always lies. He is interested in the "morality and legality" of the story because "the authority of the teachings of the synoptic Gospels, touching the nature of the spiritual world, turns upon the acceptance or the rejection of the Gadarene and other like stories." "It is exactly because these stories constitute the key-stone of the orthodox arch" that he is so greatly obliged for another opportunity of drawing attention to them.

There are many strange things in this article; but the most unaccountable thing is the tone of it. If all is so well with Professor Huxley's case, why such a "robustious and rough coming on"—to use his own words—in the opening pages? Is it in the best taste to refer to my own superior knowledge having given "me the uncomfortable feeling that I had my adversary (Mr. Gladstone) at a disadvantage?" and to add that "the sun of science, at my back, was in his eyes?" "I now ask my readers," he says on the fourth page, "to accompany me on a little voyage of discovery in search of the side on which the rapid judgment and the ignorance of the literature of the subject lie. I think I may promise them very little trouble, and a good deal of entertainment." Then, on the following page, we are told about "bales of reading," and "something more than a hasty glimpse of two or three passages of Josephus." Is it not enough to make the warmest sympathiser restless and even suspicious to have so much promise while the armour is being buckled on? Already, on page two, Mr. Huxley has made a glaring mistake in taunting Mr. Gladstone with not having cited a passage which actually does stand cited in Mr. Gladstone's papers in full.

Professor Huxley's objections to this keystone of the orthodox arch is that the narrators of it show no inkling of the moral and legal difficulties which arise. "Everything that I know of law and justice convinces me that the wanton destruction of other people's property is a misdemeanour of evil example." Mr. Gladstone found an answer in the supposition that the possession of the swine was unlawful, and therefore justly punishable by their loss. It is to meet this argument that Professor Huxley writes his article. "After weighing all the arguments," no doubt remains on his mind that "Gadarene" is the proper reading. Whereupon his method is simply to show that Gadara was a Gentile and not a Jewish city. This is the entertainment which he promises, and this is the entertainment which he furnishes.

The method of proof is most satisfactory. We make little account of the display of references to Josephus, since it may be seen that in reality Professor Huxley's authority is Schürer's *Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ.* And he could not have landed better. Schürer's "classical work" is all that he describes it. It "puts the whole evidence before serious students, with full reference to the needful authorities, and in a thoroughly judicial manner." But the serious student may well ask whether it was worth while to condense Schürer's interesting pages for this particular purpose. Is it so certain that the pig owners were really Gadarenes? And if they were, does it affect the interpretation of the miracle, or the truth of the gospels, whether they were Jews or Gentiles?

The miracle is recorded in all three synoptic gospels (Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 1; Luke viii. 26), and it is well known that in all these places both MSS. and Versions vary between three readings, "Gadarenes," "Gergesenes," and "Gerasenes." The Authorised Version, following the *Textus Receptus*, has "Gergesenes" in Matthew, and "Gadarenes" in Mark and Luke. The Revised Version, on the other hand, gives "Gadarenes" in Matthew, and "Gerasenes" in Mark and Luke, following or at least agreeing with Westcott and Hort. We have not promised "a good deal of entertainment," but it would be too tedious to give the evidence of the MSS. and Versions. It is enough to notice, in a sentence, the judgment of the other leading editors. Lachmann reads "Gerasenes" in all three places; Tischendorf "Gadarenes" in Matthew, "Gerasenes" in Mark, and "Gergesenes" in Luke; while Tregelles has "Gadarenes" in Matthew, and "Gerasenes" in the other two places, thus agreeing with Westcott and Hort.

Now, can any explanation be found of this variety of reading? There is a book on the Four Gospels by Principal M'Clellan of Cirencester (Macmillan, 1875), known to most serious students, though Professor Huxley betrays no knowledge of it, which we never turn to in vain on points like these. There we find that the testimony of Origen unravels the complication. "The precipitation of the swine," says Origen, "is recorded to have taken place in the country of the *Gerasenes.* But Gerasa [viz. Gerasa *of Gilead*] is in Arabia, near neither sea nor lake. In a *few* copies we have found 'into the country of the *Gadarenes';* but Gadara is in Judea [Peræa], equally without precipices by a lake. . . . But Gergesa, whence are the *Gergesenes*, is an ancient city by the Lake of Tiberias, with a precipice. . . . It is interpreted, 'the dwelling of expellers,' as if prophetic of the act of its inhabitants towards the Saviour."

This quotation from Origen may be found, by those who have not Origen's works, in almost any commentary. But we quote it as found in Mr. M'Clellan's note, because of the clear and convincing judgment he pronounces upon it. "Origen decisively attests that *Gerasenes* was the prevalent reading, apparently in all three evangelists, in nearly all the copies known to him; that *Gadarenes* was found only in a few, and *Gergesenes*, it may be inferred, in none." Jerome confirms the existence of a village called Gergesa, as "still shown to this day, above the mountain close by the Lake of Tiberias." *But he always renders the word in the gospels "Gerasenes."* Thus the variations are easily accounted for. "Gergesa" or "Gerasa," supposing that such a place existed, was but an obscure village close by the Sea of Galilee. Gerasa, on the other hand, was an important city in Gilead (or Arabia Peræa, as Origen says), and Gadara was, perhaps, still better known as a city of the Deca-

polis. The reading in Origen's day was "Gerasenes;" but the copyists, thinking this referred to the well-known Gerasa in Gilead, and knowing that the miracle could not have occurred there, at a distance of twenty miles from the Sea of Galilee, altered it to "Gadarenes," since at Gadara there were the "tombs," and other particulars of the miracle, and it might easily be supposed that the whole district took its name from this chief city. Gadara is a little over six miles from the lake. As for the third reading "Gergesenes," we owe it either to Origen's own conjecture ("plainly a mere guess," says Keim), who had the Girgashites of the Old Testament in his mind; or else Gergesa was, as Ewald suggests, a dialectic variety of the name *Gerasa*.

The right word is "Gerasenes"—so the textual authority leads us to determine—*if there was another town called "Gerasa," so situated as to meet the demands of the narratives in the Gospels.* Says Edersheim: "The ruins right over against the plain of Gennesaret, which still bear the name of *Kersa* or *Gersa*, must represent the ancient Gerasa." It is to Dr. William Thomson that the honour belongs of identifying these ruins. The story is well told in *The Land and the Book*, and is familiar to most Biblical students. Dr. Thomson, whose acquaintance with readings was not, of course, extensive,—he speaks here of a reading "Geresa,"—rather hastily prefers the form *Gergesa*. But that is a matter of small consequence, and is probably due to a determination to keep away from the Gilead Gerasa as well as from Gadara. Both of these places he proves to be impossible. "But in this Gersa, or Chersa, we have a position which fulfils every requirement of the narratives." Few identifications have been accepted by subsequent explorers in Palestine with greater unanimity. And in such a matter these are our only authorities. Thus Dr. Tristram (*The Land of Israel*, p. 461), while seeing in the scenery of Gadara all the concomitant events of the miracle, except one, holds that exception fatal to the claims of the well-known city, for the "steep place" does not run down to the *sea*, but to the little river. He adds another objection, however. "St. Mark tells us that our Lord was met *immediately* on his coming out of the ship. But Gadara (Um Keis is the modern name) is three and a half hours distant from the shores of the lake. He therefore indorses the suggestion of Dr. Thomson, and describes the discovery as most interesting and important. Mr. Macgregor ("Rob Roy"), from independent observation, comes to the same conclusion. Professor Socin, also, in Bædeker's *Palästina*, accepts the identification; and the explorers of the Palestine Exploration Fund, though some of them are apparently not quite decided (see Mr. Armstrong's *Names and Places in the Old and New Testaments*, a semi-official volume), suggest this site and mention no other. And yet Professor Huxley says: "The existence of any place called Gergesa is declared by the weightiest authorities whom I have consulted to be very questionable;" and with these words he brushes aside the evidence we have produced. One would have been glad to know the names of some of his "weightiest authorities."

As for the weightiest authorities, they seem to be fairly unanimous in the opinion that the scene of the miracle was not Gadara at all, and with that Professor Huxley's whole article becomes, so far as it bears upon the morality and legality of the miracle, the vainest beating of the air.

But suppose the evidence had led the other way, and Mr. Huxley's historical studies of Schürer had been more appropriate, does it follow that to prove the town of Gadara ruled by Romans then, proves these particular pig-owners Gentile? It does not seem so. Keim, whose orthodoxy can bear no taint of suspicion we presume to Professor Huxley, says that "there were many Jews settled in the district of Gadara," and gives for his statement the very authority of Josephus, whom Professor Huxley is here seen quoting so freely. Keim thinks that the impression produced by what was said favours the supposition that they *were* Jews. Ewald and Weizsäcker agree.

But it is a point not worth debating. Of far more importance is the question, Whether the morality and legality of the narratives stand in any need of this argument? Professor Huxley thinks so; and he is evidently of opinion that that is Mr. Gladstone's belief also. Let it be observed, however, that Mr. Gladstone deliberately puts aside

other, and to him higher, arguments in favour of their morality and legality, in order to reach one which might be nearer the ground occupied by the "negative school." One such argument—whether it has the sun of science in its face or at its back we leave Professor Huxley to judge—was suggested long ago by Bengel. "*Damnum dæmonibus adscribendum*," says Bengel, in his pregnant way: "the pig-owners' loss was the doing of the demons." If Jesus had the power to order the expulsion of the demons from one of God's creatures, He had the power to permit them to enter another. You cannot challenge the morality of the latter power, if you grant the former. For the authority to command evil spirits, if it existed in Jesus, at once lifts Him up to a place beyond the reach of the mere creature. It brings Him into touch with the powers and responsibilities of the Creator. And then Bengel's judgment is right: the damage was done by the devils, and you must call in question the *existence* of devils, and, finally, the existence of evil in any shape or form.

We referred recently to the words *pistis*, *pepoithesis*, and *parrhesia*. A correspondent in the *Christian* considered that the Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe, M.A., was not justified in drawing a clear distinction between them, and expressing it by *pistis*, faith; *pepoithesis*, trust; and *parrhesia*, confidence. Mr. Webb-Peploe's reply was that the distinction is Scriptural, and he referred to Eph. ii. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 4; 1 John ii. 28 and iv. 17, where the several words are rendered as above.

Mr. Webb-Peploe further adds (in a note to ourselves), that he believes that many of the practical difficulties in which Christians find themselves, arise from failing to observe the difference between these three words, and to act them out, as required to do in God's Word. "*Faith* seems to express that receptivity of the soul by which we are led to take in whatever God offers; *trust*, that passivity (or shall we say 'repose') of soul, by which we are led to calmly leave all in the hands of God; and *confidence*, or 'boldness,' that activity of soul by which we are led to step out anywhere and everywhere that God may call us, even if it be into His own immediate presence." If there is really such a difference in the meaning of these words, the distinction is surely most important, and deserves a fuller recognition.

The Indwelling of the Spirit in Individuals.

I.

By the Rev. F. H. Ringwood, LL.D.

Is it scriptural to speak of any individual Christian as a "temple of the Holy Spirit?"

My impression is that so to speak is non-scriptural. What follows aims at proving this.

Before making the attempt, I must deprecate prejudice by stating that I do not, in the slightest degree, question the spiritual and moral inferences which are derived generally from the revealed fact of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the true followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. 1 Peter ii. 5 summarizes my view: "Ye yourselves also, as *living stones*, are being built up a *spiritual house*," which teaches that the temple of the Holy Spirit consists of the aggregate of Christian believers, each of whom is figured as a stone pervaded by the life-imparting Spirit. My opinion is that this conception of Christ's Church prevails throughout the New Testament without a single exception. If any well-established variation from this magnificent idea of our Lord's true Church can be produced from Holy Scripture, I shall not, of course, presume to challenge it. If no such diversity of metaphor exist, I dare not acquiesce in its employment by any merely human preacher or uninspired commentator.

It will be admitted by all that the sacred structure in which the Shechina dwelt was called the temple or *ναός*. The word appears frequently in this sense in the New Testament—*e.g.* Matt. xxiii. 16, 17, 21, xxvi. 61, xxvii. 5, 40, 51; Mark xv. 38; Luke i. 9, 21, 22, 23, 45; John ii. 20.

Again, it will not be disputed that our Lord spoke of His own body as a temple, *ναός*—John ii. 19, 21, in connection with which may be cited the remarkable passage in Apoc. xxi. 22, and Col. ii. 9, "In Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (*σωματικῶς*)."

Thirdly, we find the Christian Church described as the *ναός* of God repeatedly in the Epistles of St. Paul—a conception foreshadowed, perhaps, by our Lord's language in that memorable passage in Matt. xvi. 18, *οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, and

not without its anticipations in the Prophets of the elder Dispensation.

In St. Paul this revealed fact is affirmed or implied frequently; thrice in 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. The merely English reader must bear in mind that, in the original language, there is no possibility of vagueness about the meaning of "you." Here and always the word is ὑμεῖς and ὑμῖν, utterly different in sound and appearance from the word which means "thou" or "you" in the singular, viz. σύ. Again, we find the same truth twice in 2 Cor. vi. 16. Similarly in Eph. ii. 21, etc., "In whom all the (οἰκοδομή) building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple (ναός) in the Lord; in whom ye also (ὑμεῖς) are builded together for a dwelling-place of God in the Spirit." The sense may be the same in 2 Thess. ii. 4, which cannot possibly convey the meaning which I am combating.

Besides this use of the word ναός itself as referring to the Christian Church, and not to any Christian individual, there are other passages which convey the same or a similar thought. Thus in Heb. iii. 6, "But Christ as a son over his house; whose house we are." 1 Peter ii. 5, "Ye are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

Furthermore, there are a series of passages which convey an analogous conception of the Church as the "body of Christ," which is very important in reference to this inquiry. Thus, in Rom. xii. 5, we read, "We, who are many, are one body (σῶμα) in Christ;" in 1 Cor. x. 17, "We, who are many, are one loaf, one body;" in 1 Cor. xii. 13, "We have all been baptized into one body;" 1 Cor. xii. 27, "Ye are the body of Christ, and severally members;" in Eph. i. 23, "The Church, which is His body;" Eph. ii. 16, "Reconcile both unto God in one body;" in Eph. iv. 4, "One body, and one Spirit;" Eph. iv. 12, "For the building up of the body of Christ;" Eph. iv. 16, "From whom the whole body," etc.; Eph. v. 23, "He Himself is the Saviour of the body;" Eph. v. 30, "We are members of His body;" Col. i. 18, "He is the head of the body, the Church;" Col. i. 24, "For His body's sake, which is the Church;" Col. ii. 19, "From whom all the body," etc.; Col. iii. 15, "To which also ye were called in one body."

It is clear, then, that the Christian Church is represented to us as being the body of Christ, and individual Christians as being severally limbs or members of that body. This figure finds its parallel in that of Christians being severally "living stones" which constitute the "spiritual house" or "temple of God," in which "the Spirit of God dwells" (1 Cor. iii. 16).

Who would not be startled if a commentator or preacher asserted that any single believer was "the body of Christ?" And yet we have become familiar with what seems to be an equally astounding notion that every true Christian is "the temple of God!" If this be true, there must be a vast number of "temples of God." But the fact is, that this word "temple" (ναός) never occurs in the plural throughout the New Testament except in reference to the temples of Diana, made by the silversmith, Demetrius (Acts xix. 24), and in Acts vii. 48 and Acts xvii. 24, where it is asserted that God does not dwell in temples made by hands. Whence, then, did this notion, so opposed to the analogy of Scripture, arise? It appears to be derived exclusively from the interpretation put upon 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. In this passage it is assumed that "your body" (τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν), ad lit. "the body of you" (plur.), means "thy body" in the singular, and that "the Holy Spirit which is in you" (plur. ὑμῖν) means "which is in thee;" and this, although the plural is used all through in the rest of the passage, "which you (plur.) have," etc.; and so in ver. 20, "the body of you" (plur.). "and in the spirit of you" (plur.) It also appears not to have been noticed that just before—*i.e.* in the 15th verse—"the bodies" of Christians (τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν) are stated to be limbs or "members of Christ," from which it follows that, in the writer's thought, the aggregate of their bodies made up "the body of Christ," according to Scripture usage, as shown above. With this would agree the idea that "the body of you" (plur.)—consisting of you—"is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you" (plur.). It is also to be observed that "the body of you" (plur.), in ver. 19, is in sharply defined and immediate contrast with the body of an individual in the preceding verse, "sinneth against his own body"—τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, ver. 18, with τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν, ver. 19, with which we may compare 1 Tim. iii. 5, where τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου, "his own house," is contrasted with "the Church of God," which Church is (1 Tim. iii. 15) identified with "the house of God."

When I say it is weighed that τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν in ver. 15, are asserted to be μέλη χριστοῦ, which implies that the aggregate of bodies are Christ's body, and that in this same epistle, chap. xii. 27, it is plainly stated "ye are Christ's body," ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα χριστοῦ; and when the whole analogy of Scripture language in reference to the Christian Church being the body of Christ is considered, it appears to rise to the highest degree of probability that "your body," *i.e.* "the body of you" (plur.) in 1 Cor. vi. 19, does not mean the body of an individual Christian, but that which consists of all Christians, and is described as the body of Christ, or the body which has Christ for its Head.

This view does not in any wise diminish the force of the moral appeal made here by the

*

Apostle. Is it not infinitely more than sufficient for any merely human creature to become a member of Christ's body—a living portion of that universal temple in which God's Holy Spirit dwells?

II.

By the Rev. Principal H. C. G. Moule, M.A.

I have read with care and interest Dr. Ringwood's very able paper which you have kindly sent me in proof. Its argument, and I may add its tone, commands both attention and respect, and I feel that on many points of detail it is highly instructive. But I still venture to hold that 1 Cor. vi. 19, at least *includes* a reference to the body of the individual Christian, and entitles us to say with proper reserve, and in remembrance of other truth, that "the body"—the physical frame, regarded in the abstract—is, in each believer's case, a temple (ναός) of the blessed Spirit.

My main reason is the context before and after verse 19. Just before, the Apostle has been pressing the sacred law of purity in the body (and the secret for a victorious doing of that law, by realised union with Christ); and just after, verse 20, he proceeds, "Glorify God *in your body*;" where, surely, we must understand the body in the sense of, *e.g.*, verse 15. The whole point of the intensely practical previous argument would surely be lost if we have, in verses 19, 20, a sudden transition to the Mystical Body—a *totally* different matter under an identical term.

I would repeat, what I implied above, that "your body" is a phrase equivalent to "the body," when we use the term undistributed. "Your body," I hold, equals "The body, as you have to do with it."

Meanwhile I see no necessary contradiction between my contention about 1 Cor. vi. 19, and the great truth of the corporate life of the saints in Christ, to which Dr. Ringwood so forcibly points our attention. I seem to see running all through the Scripture imagery about the Church the principle that each μέρος, or μέλος (each part or portion), of the total is also a miniature of the total. For example, take the blessed Indwelling. We have, "I *in them* and Thou in me." We have (Eph. ii. 22) the whole Church as the Habitation of God. But *also*, "We will make our abode with *him*;" "I will come in to *him*;" "Christ dwelling in your *hearts* (surely individually) by faith." And so here (1 Cor. vi. 15) "the *members of an harlot* (*i.e.*, the physical frame of an unhappy individual fornicator) are regarded as being by right "the members of Christ." The imagery here is not of the man's body being *a limb* but *the limbs* of Christ; suggesting the idea that, *from one point of view*, Christ *de jure* so possesses that man as to claim his frame as his Lord's *frame*.

I am compelled to write under pressure, time being scarce with me. But I trust I have at least indicated the line in which I would attempt an answer to some contentions of Dr. Ringwood's paper—of whose ability and deep reverence of tone I must again express my strong sense.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xii. 31.

"Desire earnestly the greater gifts" (R.V.).

Exposition.

"*Desire earnestly.*"—Literally, *be envious* or *jealous of*. It is translated, "zealously affect," in Gal. iv. 17, 18. It perhaps implies an indirect rebuke of the envy felt by many Corinthians for *those who possessed* the best gifts. It is as though St. Paul had said, "If you are envious at all, be envious *for the gifts*, not of those who have received them."—*Shore.*

"*Greater.*"—The MSS. are divided between "better" (κρείττονα) and "greater" (μείζονα). The former seems to me preferable, taken in the sense of "more useful," the gifts most capable of producing the common edification.—*Godet.*

The gifts specially in view are prophecy and teaching.—*Godet.*

The touchstone is charity; choose those that most readily group themselves round that great centre.—*John Ker.*

Critical Note.

Reuss asks, How can we *seek* gifts? He sees here an insoluble contradiction between the two elements of Paul's view: Divine gift and human pursuit. But (1) Prayer implies both pursuit and gift; (2) the gift may be a germ which is to be cultivated.—*Godet.*

He does not strike a middle course between the assertion of God's sovereignty and of man's freedom, or attempt to reconcile them, but fearlessly maintains both as the foundation of practical exhortation.—*Edwards.*

The Spirit takes account of the receptive capacity and mental tendency of the individual.—*Meyer.*

The effort to obtain both ordinary and extraordinary gifts would include cultivation of the corresponding natural powers, prayer and faith for the Spirit's presence and activity, and use of the spiritual power already possessed.—*Beet.*

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

The Best Gifts to be Coveted.

By the Rev. John Ker, D.D.

1. *What some of the best gifts are.*—Not anything external to the soul's nature—as money or power. Nor all inward gifts—as taste, culture: these are good, but not the best. He means those gifts with which the spirit of charity is connected. Reverence and humility towards God, candid and generous judgment towards our fellowmen; as regards ourselves—patience, contentment, courage; as to things around—the temperance of chastened desire. These gifts go deepest into our nature; they are the most lasting; and they are most godlike.

2. *The frame of mind we are to cherish towards these gifts*—"Covet them earnestly." It was a bold word for Paul to use, who says elsewhere, that this very commandment, "Thou shalt not covet," first revealed to him his heart. The only coveting in which there is no sin, is the coveting of a loving spirit and the gifts that gather closest around it. We are to covet them *earnestly*, as an avaricious man pursues wealth. (1) Try to discover what is best in those around you, and rejoice in it. (2) Mingle much with those who have the best gifts in a large degree. (3) In coveting them, we never harm either ourselves or others; and (4) We are sure to gain them.

II.

The Gifts of Civilisation.

By the Very Rev. R. W. Church, D.C.L., Dean of St. Paul's.

In these words St. Paul seems at once to put his sanction on all the great results of human civilisation, and at the same time to open a wider view beyond it, and to claim for man a higher end and a higher law of life than even it can give. I use the word "civilisation" to mean all skill and endeavour and achievement, all exercise and development of thought, restricted to the sphere of present things. The contrast between civilisation and the religion of the New Testament is sometimes openly avowed, more often secretly and importunately felt. It is true they have worked together, but they are often arrayed in opposition; and minds under the influence of the one are apt to shrink from or grow impatient with the other. And they *are* distinct. But they have essentially one origin, and come both from Him who has made man for this world as well as intended him for another.

The world easily suggests very awful views of its own condition; but it would indeed be far more dreadful if we must not see in its civilisation the leading and guiding hand of God, the real gifts of the Author and Giver of all good things. The gifts of civilisation have been ill-used by luxury and pride for impurity and wrong. But the gifts at Corinth were foolishly and wrongly used. However our civilisation comes, and however it is used, it is one of God's ways, as real as the sun and air and rain, of doing good to men.

Look at it as it is. Observe that one great fact, the progressive refinement of our human nature. Observe how men gain in power—power over themselves, power to have larger aims, and to reach them. See how great moral habits strike their roots deep in a society, habits not necessarily belonging to religion; the sense of justice as justice; the spirit of self-devoting enterprise.

Civilisation *to us* means liberty and the power of bearing and using liberty; it means that which ensures to us a peaceful life; it means growing honour for manliness, unselfishness, sincerity—growing value for gentleness, considerateness, and respect for others; it means readiness to bear criticism, to see and amend our mistakes; it means the passion to raise the weak and low.

It is not wonderful that, when we come fresh from the New Testament, it should all seem too dazzling. It is easy to say, *Leave it.* A wiser thoughtfulness, a braver and deeper faith will say, *Use it*, only believe that there is something greater beyond. "Covet earnestly the greater, the better gifts." Covet earnestly what most raises man's part here, but remember also that there is a yet more excellent way. Covet God's gifts, but above His gifts, that which God essentially is—covet Love.

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

There is an ordinary theological distinction of the manifestation of the Holy Ghost into "gifts" and "graces." I presume it to mean that when the Holy Ghost manifests His presence in a man's moral or spiritual nature we call the result a "grace"; and when the epiphany is in his intellectual or mental nature we call it a "gift." Thus eloquence, poetic genius, musical talent, philosophical power, are called "gifts"; and gentleness, patience, chastity, "graces." I fear the distinction has exercised a narrowing influence upon the conception we form of the work of the Holy Spirit in the new creation, making us slower to recognise His presence in the graces of the saints than in the intellectual gifts of men.—*Bishop Fraser.*

In the catalogue of gifts we discover two classes, the natural and the supernatural—personal endowments of mind *elevated* by the gift of the Spirit, and those which were *created* by the same influence. Just as if the temperature of this northern hemisphere were raised suddenly, and a mighty tropical river were to pour its fertilising inundation over the country. The result would be the impartation of a vigorous and gigantic growth to the vegetation already in existence, and, at the same time, the development of life in seeds and germs which had long lain latent in the soil, incapable of vegetation in the unkindly climate of their birth. —*F. W. Robertson.*

Though the gifts enumerated by St. Paul have in these latter days, for some inscrutable purpose of the Divine counsel, ceased to be *miraculous*, they still exist, *every one of them*, as the fruit of labour and reward of toil; tokens of a great and blessed law, the necessity of man's co-operation with God, as in his spiritual so in his intellectual development; tokens of the Holy Spirit's continued presence with the Church, and that the promise of the Lord Jesus has been abundantly fulfilled.—*Bishop Fraser.*

I confess myself totally unable to discover any reason for which certain of these gifts and ministries are now spoken of as extraordinary, intended only for an emergency, and for ever ceased. I do not believe this, and long ago I publicly expressed my conviction that it was erroneous. If they be restored I will greatly rejoice; that they are not with us I greatly grieve and lament. Well am I assured that they are every baptized person's privilege, as much as the forgiveness of sins.—*Edward Irving: Prophetical Works*, i. p. 515.

If you think that the faith which could remove mountains is an extinct gift I would ask you to read the story of George Müller of Bristol, who feeds, clothes, and educates I know not how many hundreds of orphan children, *simply in faith*; dispensing with the usual eleemosynary machinery, not knowing what each day may bring forth, but finding himself, as he would say, miraculously sustained, encouraged, and provided for—mountains removed, and his way made plain.—*Bishop Fraser.*

Covet earnestly the best gifts, the best bodily gifts, the best intellectual gifts, the best spiritual gifts. And if you covet them, labour to win them. And if you win them, see to it how you use them. For each gift carries with it a proportionate responsibility. "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man *to profit withal.*" "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same, *one to another*, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." *Bishop Fraser.*

The Spirit of Christ manifests itself not merely in the mystical convulsions of an obscure and speechless emotional excitement, but in the distinct and calm feeling of the peace and joy of a child of God conscious of being reconciled with its Father; not merely in apocalyptic visions of miraculous things in the future, but in a clear and reasonable knowledge of those things which have been given us by God, and in a wide view of the wonderful ways and judgments of God in the course of the world's history; not merely in theurgic powers and miraculous operations of an abrupt character, but in the constant moral power of love, which is the greatest of miracles.—*Pfleiderer: Hibbert Lecture.*

The receptivity which comes with earnest and practical desire is, in the case of each individual, the determining cause as to what gift the Spirit will give.—*Shore.*

Milton, of all our English race, is, by his diction and rhythm, the one artist of the highest rank in "the great style" whom we have. To what does he owe this supreme distinction? To nature first and foremost, to that bent of nature for inequality which to the worshippers of the average man is so unacceptable, to a gift, a Divine favour. "The older one grows," says Goethe, "the more one prizes natural gifts, because by no possibility can they be procured and stuck on." Nature formed Milton to be a great poet. But what other poet has shown so sincere a sense of the grandeur of his vocation, and a moral effort so constant and sublime to make and keep himself worthy of it? The Milton of poetry is the man, in his own magnificent phrase, of "devout prayer to that Eternal Spirit that can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his Seraphim with the hallowed fire of His altar, to touch and purify the lips of whom He pleases."—*Matthew Arnold: Century, May* 1888.

Matthew xii. 43–45, and Psalm xxix. 6.

Two communications, not sent us as Requests for Reply, may find a place here:—

1. Matt. xii. 43–45.—Will you accept the following on that parable? The unclean spirit, representing man's nature from the Adamic birth; the cleansing the work of God alone, as seen in John xv. 3, or by the cleansing of the lepers (Luke xvii. 14); then the cleansed man takes no heed of God, as did Isaiah when cleansed by the coal from the altar, and thus the bad spirits find entrance again, and he returns, as the dog or sow, to his filth.—F. J. Pakenham.

2. In Psalm xxix. 6 the R.V. has given us—"Lebanon and Sirion like a young, wild ox." Professor Cheyne—"And Lebanon he makes to skip like a calf, and Sirion like a young wild ox." The LXX. translates the latter clause: καὶ ὁ ἠγαπημένος ὡς υἱὸς μονοκερώτων. Will any of your readers explain why Mount Hermon is here styled "*The Beloved?*"—R. Balgarnie, D.D.

St. Mark xiv. 14, 15; St. Luke xii. 11, 12.

By the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D., Master of University College, Durham.

"The Master saith, Where is [my] guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he will [himself] shew you a large upper room furnished [and ready: and] there make ready [for us]."[1]

These words form part of that common tradition, of which all three Evangelists manifestly make use. As usual, St. Mark gives us most of it: his reproduction of it contains a few words which are not in St. Luke's account. And both of them give us a great deal more than is contained in the parallel passage in St. Matthew's Gospel. It is comparatively recently that we have been able to arrive at a sure conclusion on this interesting question, and to regard it as certain that the three first Evangelists do make use of some previously existing material, from which all three of them quote largely. At first sight this seems to be a serious loss. Where we formerly thought that we had three writers,—each of them giving independent testimony to the same facts, so that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word was established,—now we find that we have only one witness, for all three are drawing from one and the same source. But the Lord gives as well as takes away; and what we have lost on the one hand we have gained on the other.[2] It is quite obvious that if, in all three Gospels, there is material which comes from one and the same source, this source must be *earlier* than any of the three Gospels, and therefore more nearly contemporary with the gracious facts which all three report for the comfort and healing of mankind. And the report of one witness, who puts his testimony into shape soon after the events which he records occurred, is worth much more than the report of three witnesses who do not begin to arrange their material until twenty or thirty years later. We may be thankful that this fact about there being a carefully drawn up record (whether in writing or in men's memories matters very little) long before even the earliest of our Gospels was written, has now been satisfactorily established. It is a very strong guarantee for the truth of the Gospel narrative, and we are able to "know the certainty concerning the things wherein we have been instructed."

It is a matter of very little moment whether, in the passage before us, we regard the whole of what Christ says to Peter and John as due to His supernatural knowledge or as the result of prearrangement with the man who was to lend the room, or as partly the one and partly the other. That our Lord possessed the power of knowing what was taking place at a distance, or of knowing beforehand what would take place at some future hour, we know well from a variety of occasions—Nathanael, the nobleman's son, the centurion's servant, Lazarus, etc. etc. We also know that He did not always make use of this miraculous power, but acquired knowledge just as we do, viz., by asking questions or by experience. He asked where they had buried Lazarus, and not until He had tasted the wine mingled with myrrh did He refuse to drink it. In a case like the present, where it is not quite evident which of the two is correct, we must be content to remain in uncertainty. And whichever view we may prefer ourselves, we ought not to condemn others for adopting the other one. One thing seems clear, that the man who is to lend the room knows Jesus, and is in some measure a disciple. All three narratives have the remarkable words, "The *Master* saith," as if the man himself recognised Jesus as his Master. Moreover, St. Luke's "Where is *the* guest-chamber?" and still more St. Mark's "Where is *My* guest-chamber?" seem to imply that the man had already been told by some one that such a room would be required. But this some one need not have been the Master Himself. Jerusalem, at the time of the Passover, was so crowded with Jews from all parts of the world, amounting to hundreds of thousands, that the difficulty of finding a room, and especially a quiet room, was very great indeed. But another interesting question remains. Was "the guest-chamber," for which the Master asked, the same as "the upper room" which He knew beforehand would be assigned to Him? There is reason for believing that it was not. One has no right to be very positive about it, but the Greek word which is used for "guest-chamber,"[3] does not so easily become equivalent to the Greek word which is used for "upper room,"[4] as the two English words become equivalent to one another. For "guest-chamber" the same word is used as we have at the beginning of St. Luke's Gospel for the "inn," in which Mary and Joseph could find no room when they arrived at Bethlehem for the enrolment or census (ch. ii. 7). It indicates a place

[1] The words in brackets are wanting in St. Luke.

[2] See Dr. Sanday's *Oracles of God*, Lecture III.

[3] κατάλυμα.

[4] ἀνώγεον or ἀνάγαιον.

where travellers and their beasts are freed from their burdens. In an ordinary house, which was not a house of public entertainment, this place for unloosing burdens would be the ground floor. In dwellings in the East, at the present time, it is a very common thing for the space at the basement to be a room which the family share with outsiders and even with animals, if they possess any, and which may contain vehicles as well as household furniture. When they want more privacy they go into the room above this, or else on to the flat roof, on which there is often a tent or a summer-house. So that it is quite possible that Christ asked for the lower room or common hall, and that the man gave him, not this, but the best room that he had, viz., the upper one reserved for special purposes.

If this is so, then we have an example for our imitation, that, when Christ makes any claim upon us for service, we should endeavour to give Him, not just what the letter of His request demands of us, but the best that we can supply. Too often our first thought is, if not a flat refusal, a determination to give the very least that is consistent with compliance at all.

But leaving this point uncertain, there is the very definite description of the room which Christ did receive, whether it is precisely what He asked for or not.

It is an *upper* room ; it is *furnished* and *ready ;* and it is a *large* room.

1. The meaning of *upper* room has been already explained. It was not the hall or general gathering-place, which, if employed for the Passover meal, would very likely be used by two or three parties at once, but the private room above, where Christ could be alone with His disciples. This last point He seems to indicate in the question, "Where is *My* guest-chamber?" Whatever room is granted to Him, He wishes to have it all to Himself, that He may speak face to face with His friends and without reserve or danger of interruption.

2. By *furnished* and *ready* is no doubt meant supplied with the tables and couches necessary for the Paschal Supper, and perhaps also with the cups and dishes that would be required. Although at first the Passover was eaten standing, in memory of the haste in which the Israelites had fled from Egypt, yet, for many years before our Lord's time, it had become customary to recline during the meal, to indicate that Israel was no longer in fear and in bondage, but in safety, peace, and freedom.

3. By a *large* room we are probably to understand that it was unusually large, or at any rate affording ample accommodation for the party of thirteen for whom it was required.

It is not only at the Paschal season, nor only when He visits us in the Holy Communion of His body and blood, that we, like the unknown disciple in the Gospel narrative, may have Jesus Christ as our Guest. At all seasons of the year, and on festivals and ordinary days alike, the question, which is at once a warning and an invitation, is addressed to each one of us, "Where is My guest-chamber?" And we, far more than the owner of that honoured house in Jerusalem, have had opportunities of knowing all that that question means. It is no guest-chamber built with hands that He needs, but the temple built without hands, which temple we are. In each one of us He desires to have, not merely a guest-chamber for a single night, but an abode and a home.

That which was provided for Him on that awful evening before the Passion is a guide to us in making preparation for Him. If that hospitable disciple would do so much for His entertainment during a few hours, surely we may do as much when we aim at having Him for our Guest for ever, —throughout life and in eternity.

It must be an *upper* room, in the highest part of our being, the best that we have to offer to any one. It must be in our heart of hearts, where we can love Him, not in word and tongue, but in deed and truth, with all our soul and all our strength. There are those who think that they have done much if they have given Him a welcome in some transitory emotion of religious excitement. But these heated feelings are not the upper room, which is ever calm and quiet; they are more akin to the common hall, where noise and excitement are frequent. It is the upper room that we must prepare for Him, that He may have it for Himself.

And it must be a *furnished* room and *ready*— furnished with those things which He loves, and which will enable Him to rest and abide,—prayers and hymns, thanksgivings and intercessions, holy thoughts, kind words, and good deeds.

"Alms all around and hymns within"—that is the atmosphere in which Christ can abide ; and the heart that is furnished with these can offer Him a home in which He may bestow His goods. For Christ is no man's debtor. If He comes as a Guest He comes open-handed, and bestows blessings without measure or stint.

And therefore we must prepare a *large* room. As we are niggardly in what we offer to Him, so also we are half-hearted and little-minded in what we ask from Him. We do not desire His graces enough, and we do not desire enough of them. We must open our hearts freely to receive the good measure, pressed down and shaken together, which He yearns to bestow. It is His own command, His own promise which says, "Open thy mouth *wide*, and I will *fill it*."

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

NEW DEPARTURE.

HAVING chosen for systematic study—

GENESIS in the Old Testament (the early chapters), and
EPHESIANS in the New Testament,

We invite our readers—so many of them as discover the need and the opportunity—to study with us either of these Books or both of them. In the issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1891, two sets of examination papers will be published upon each of these books, four sets in all.

1. The first set of questions will take Dr. Dods' *Commentary on Genesis* as basis (Clark's *Handbooks for Bible Classes*, 2s. 6d.) up to page 27, *together with such papers upon the early chapters of Genesis as appear in* THE EXPOSITORY TIMES *from the December issue* (see Dr. Lumby's introductory paper) *to the issue for May*. No knowledge of Hebrew will be expected.

2. The second set of questions will take Delitzsch's *New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i. (T. & T. Clark, 10s. 6d.) as basis, to the end of p. 204, including the Introduction, and such papers as appear in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, as stated above. An elementary knowledge of Hebrew will be counted upon.

3. The third set of questions will take Moule's *Commentary on Ephesians* (*Cambridge Bible for Colleges*, 2s. 6d.) or Agar Beet's *Ephesians* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1890, 7s. 6d.), including the Introductions and Appendices, together with such papers as appear on Ephesians in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from the present to the issue for May. No knowledge of Greek will be expected.

4. The fourth set of questions will take as basis either Meyer's *Commentary on Ephesians*, with Introduction and Notes, or the same portion of Ellicott's *Commentary* (Longmans). Some knowledge of Greek will be expected.

Any person may take Nos. 1 and 3, or 2 and 4, but not Nos. 1 and 2, or 3 and 4. The questions may be answered with the free use of these books and papers, or with the assistance of any other books at command. But it will be impossible to answer them well without careful *study* of the portions named.

For the best papers the Publishers will offer books of value, as formerly, those to Nos. 2 and 4 being of more value and of a higher class than those to Nos. 1 and 3.

But, in addition to these, we have proposals to make for more immediate practical work.

Books will be offered *every month*—

1. To the Ministers and Members of some particular Church only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or an Address on any passage occurring in Genesis i.–xi.

2. To all and sundry, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Accordingly, we offer books this month—

1. To the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Churches only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or Address on any passage in Genesis (Chapters i.–xi.). The Notes must not occupy more than half a column of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, this type. They should be after the nature of the "Methods of Treatment" in the *Great Text Commentary*, *i.e.* readable in themselves.

2. To all, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians. No restriction as to length[1] or manner of treatment will be made at present. The original Greek may be referred to or not as convenient.

The best papers will be published every month in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES; and when the writers see them there they may send to the Publishers for the book they select, out of a list which will be given. The number and value of the books will depend upon the success of this scheme of work. The writer's name and address should be given, but no names or initials will be published except of those whose papers are printed, and who do not express a desire to the contrary. The papers intended for February must be received by the Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B., by the 10th day of January, and so on for every succeeding month.

Those whose papers are found in this issue will kindly let the Publishers know which of the following books they wish sent to them:—

Delitzsch's *Iris: Studies in Colour and Talks about Flowers.*
Ahlfeld's *Voice from the Cross.*
Ewald's *Syntax of the Hebrew Language.*
Beck's *Pastoral Theology.*
Monrad's *The World of Prayer.*
Rothe's *Sermons for the Christian Year.*

[1] This, of course, within reasonable limits. Two very good papers this month (January) are quite beyond our space at present. But we reserve them, and the writers will be communicated with.

Requests and Replies.

Would you oblige by telling me the best work on the Lord's Supper—the standard work or works?—E. D.

This is a question which it is by no means easy to answer. The range of literature on the Supper is already immense; and it is growing every year. Almost every church in Christendom has its standard works on this sacrament. I venture to mention a few of the books which I have found most helpful in recent studies of the subject.

No one can afford to neglect the very pregnant chapters in Calvin's *Institutes*, book iv. chaps. xvii., xviii. After Calvin naturally comes Turretin, *Institutio*, loc. xviii. cap. xxi.–xxvii.

Of Anglican treatises, very noteworthy are those of Archbishop Cranmer (*Parker Society's Edn.*, Cambridge, 1844), Hooker (*Ecclesiastical Polity*, book v. chaps. lxvii., lxviii.), and Dr. Waterland (*Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, Clarendon Press, 1880). This last work may be regarded as the standard work of the Church of England. Apart from a certain one-sidedness, it is one of the best treatises in the language.

Of German expositions, we have many of a high type in the best systems of Dogmatic, especially Martensen (Clark) and Ebrard (*Die Christliche Dogmatik*, 2 B. s. 634). The chief monographs I know are by D. Schulz (*Die Christliche Lehre vom Heiligen Abendmahle*, 1831), K. F. A. Kahnis (*Die Lehre vom Abendmahle*, 1851), and Ebrard (*Das Dogma vom Heiligen Abendmahle u. seine Geschichte*, 1845).

The best Dutch expositions are those of Van Oosterzee (*Christian Dogmatics*, pp. 758–770, Hodder & Stoughton), and the eminent exegete, J. I. Daldes (*De Leer van het Avondmaal*).

Nonconformists in England and Scotland have not made any contributions to the study of the Supper that can be set down as of superlative value. But it would be a pity not to notice the wholesome treatises of the Puritans, Owen and Charnock: the former often published separately, the latter in his collected works (*Nichols*, vol. iv.); also the volume of W. Orme (*Congregationalist*, London, 1826), and Dr. D. King (*Presbyterian*, Edinburgh, 1843). Amongst American Presbyterians, the exposition of Dr. Hodge (*Systematic Theology*, vol. iii. part iii. chap. xx. § 13) takes a deservedly high place.

The finest separate articles I know are those of Principal W. Cunningham on "Zwingle and the Doctrine of the Sacraments" (*The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*, p. 212), of Dr. Cave on "The Lord's Supper Historically Considered" *Br. Quarterly Review*, October 1880), and, above all, of Dr. R. W. Dale on "The Doctrine of the Real Presence" (*Ecclesia, Essays on Church Problems*).

The Commentaries that deal most fully with the Supper are those of Professor J. A. Beet, Principal T. C. Edwards, and Godet, on the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*.

Calvin, Hooker, Waterland, Dale, and Beet would make a very accessible and instructive course of reading for a minister of any denomination. An excellent introduction to the whole subject is *The Sacraments*, by Professor J. Candlish (Clark's *Handbooks*).—J. P. Lilley.

---

1. Eph. ii. 2, "Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to *the prince of the power of the air*, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." What is the explanation of "the prince of the power of the air?"—J. H. S.

2. Matt. iii. 2, "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, literally "the kingdom of *the heavens*." This is the regular phrase, "the heavens" in the *plural number*. St. Paul speaks of being carried up into the *third heaven*. A strange thing it is that our translators have rendered it "heaven," in the singular number. But what is the meaning of "the kingdom of *the heavens?*" Plainly, it is an important expression; and very strange it is that such a liberty should be taken with it.—J. H. S.

1. "Prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii. 2), *i.e.* the "*Devil*," =, as Chrysostom says, to ὁ ἐπουράνιος τόπος. It is all that supra-terrestrial but sub-celestial region which is evidently the haunt, *probably the abode*, of evil spirits (cf. Job i. 7).

2. "*Heavens.*" One of the countless Hebraisms of the New Testament. The Hebrew word for "Heaven" *was always the plural* שָׁמַיִם (Shamayim), from the *unused* singular form שָׁמַי (see Gen. i. 1, and many other places).

Probably this plural form in the Hebrew was originally used from the Hebrew idea that great spaces rose tier above tier above the Earth. The literal meaning of שָׁמַיִם is "the Heights" (see Fürst and Gesenius).—H. D. M. Spence, D.D., Dean of Gloucester.

Presbyter would be glad of an explanation of Job vii. 15.

First, as to the Hebrew text. Presbyter will please note the reading מַחֲנָק in Baer's edition, which makes it quite clear that נַפְשִׁי is nominative, not genitive. In the second clause I see no reason to forsake the received reading עַצְמוֹתַי—though Cheyne, following Merx, prefers עִצְּבוֹתַי, "my pains" (cf. ix. 28). The rendering then is—

> So that my soul chooseth suffocation,
> Death rather than (these) my bones.

In plain prose: I prefer death by suffocation to this wretched skeleton. Victims of elephantiasis are said often to succumb to death by suffocation. Job in his despair finds life to be not worth living, and declares his preference for death, even in one of its most awful forms, to continued existence in such a loathsome and miserable body.—ARCHIBALD R. S. KENNEDY.

Can you name books suitable for a course of reading in Evolution, with a view to find out how far a minister can accept it?—J. M. D.

Evolution, Books to read on:—Darwin's *Origin of Species*, and *Descent of Man;* Mivart, *On the Genesis of Species*, and *Contemporary Evolution:* Wallace, *Contribution to the Theory of Natural Development*, and *Darwinism: an Exposition of the Theory of Natural Development.*

Criticisms of the Darwinian doctrine, in which the question of its relation to the doctrines of Theism and of Creation is discussed, may be found in Flint's *Theism*, pp. 390–394, and in Pfleiderer's *Philosophy of Religion* (the chapter on "Creation," where references are given to German philosophical discussions of the problem). The inquirer may also usefully consult modern Commentaries on Genesis i. and ii., and Handbooks of Christian Doctrine under the head *Creation.*

See also Janet's *Final Causes*, Martineau's *Essays, Philosophical and Theological*, Tulloch's *Theism.*—ALLAN MENZIES.

The Epistle to the Ephesians:

HINTS FOR STUDY.

BY THE REV. PROFESSOR JOSEPH AGAR BEET, RICHMOND.

THE student's first task is to find out the words actually written by St. Paul. And this is by no means difficult. For all variations of importance are noted in the margin of the English Revised Version. Where the revisers give no marginal note, the Greek text underlying their translation may be accepted with reasonable confidence as correct. Students of the Greek Testament may do still better by using Scrivener's *Editio Major* (Bell & Sons), which gives all the various readings adopted by the best critical editors. These variations are printed in thicker type, which at once arrests the reader's eye. Where recent editors agree, the student may, for practical purposes, accept their united judgment as a fair approximation to the original document. In my commentary on the Epistle I have given a list of twenty-four corrections which the revisers agree to recommend, and another list of seven where they are in doubt or their judgments differ. This second list includes all the passages open to serious doubt.

For further critical study of the text of the Epistle, Tischendorf's larger or smaller *Critical Edition* is needful. The student will here find all important readings of MSS. and Versions, and many quotations from early writers. The best way to begin is to take some twelve verses of the Epistle and examine carefully all readings of the best MSS. and Versions. Then select some one important passage and carefully examine it from all points.

The next step for those who wish to study the New Testament in the original is to gain a knowledge, as accurate as possible, of the language in which it was written. For this, Winer's *Grammar* (translated by Moulton, T. & T. Clark) is of the utmost value. The student will do well to read it from end to end, taking some hundred pages a year till he has gone through it. But in so doing, he must remember that from grammars alone no one can obtain a reliable knowledge of a language. He must use Winer only as a means of elucidating the text of the New Testament. For instance, while reading about the Greek article, he will do well to examine every article he meets with in his reading. But it is much better to read the grammar consecutively than merely to refer to it here and there. For what he needs is a complete and all-round knowledge of the language.

The student will do well to begin his actual study of the Epistle to the Ephesians by reading it carefully through in the Revised Version, noting as he goes along the chief turning points of the Apostle's thought. He will soon see that the Epistle falls into two main divisions, each embracing three chapters, the first containing doctrine, the second chiefly morals. These main divisions he must then further divide. He will notice that the earlier one begins with praise for blessings already received, passing into prayer for further development, then a recognition of salvation already wrought in the readers, this being looked at from two points, personal and ecclesiastical, then some account of the Gospel committed to Paul, leading up lastly to a still loftier prayer.

Having thus gained a general idea of the scope of the Epistle, the student will bring all his resources to bear upon the first of the sections into which he has divided it.

The *words* of the Epistle need, and will well repay, careful attention. For this Bruder's *Greek Concordance* (Williams and Norgate) is of utmost value. It gives the context of each place in which every word is used in the Greek Testament. And its broad margins give room for noting their various uses. Also very useful is Grimm's *Lexicon*, in Latin from Williams & Norgate, English translation published by Clark. This gives the various meanings of each word, with references to the New Testament, to the LXX., and to classical Greek. To these works may be added Cremer's *Lexicon*, in German from Williams & Norgate, translation published by Clark, which gives a fuller exposition of the more important words.

The student will notice that with the words of the New Testament are associated conceptions derived from Greek thought, and others derived from the Old Testament. Each of these currents of thought must be carefully explored.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, the complicated construction of the long sentences needs careful attention. Each sentence should be patiently analysed. Notice the main assertion or exhortation, and then the subordinate clauses grouped around it. The participial clauses deserve special attention; for their logical relation to the main clauses is only slightly indicated by the grammatical construction. The emphatic words should be carefully observed; for these will frequently indicate the Apostle's line of thought.

The best commentary is, on the whole, in my view, that of Meyer, translation published by Clark. This I cordially recommend to every student of the Greek Testament. It is marked by accurate grammatical scholarship, and by delicate exegetical tact. Ellicott's *Commentary* is also very useful for its careful study of minute grammatical details. With these excellent works, no modern expositions can be compared.

But no commentary must supersede personal mental grappling with the actual text of the Epistle. For this reason it is undesirable to multiply commentaries. What is most needed is immediate and sustained contact with the words and thought of the writer.

With the methods and aids mentioned above, the student will endeavour to follow the thought of St. Paul, to grasp the ideas which he designed his words to convey to the minds of his readers. And he will do more than this. Each Epistle is a window through which we can look into the mind of the Great Apostle, a mirror in which we can see reflected his conception of the Gospel and of Christ. To reproduce this conception is the real aim of all intelligent study of the Bible. To this end we must group together St. Paul's various teaching on each several topic, and thus endeavour to reproduce his thoughts as they grouped themselves in his own mind. Each Epistle thus studied will increase our knowledge of the theology of St. Paul. And, by combining the results derived from each Epistle, we shall gain something more valuable than can be learnt from any one Epistle, viz. the broad and deep thought about the Unseen which underlay all his Epistles, and of which each one is a partial embodiment.

We shall go still further. In the various documents of the New Testament we shall find different types of teaching. The outward differences, and the deep underlying harmony, of these types will assure us that the elements common to all are in very truth the actual teaching of Christ.

We shall do well to keep ever before us, in all our study of the New Testament, this its ultimate aim.

Once more. Our study of the teaching of St. Paul will afford evidence, in the wonderful harmony of its various parts and its harmony with other New Testament teaching, in its close relation to supposed facts,—*e.g.* the death and resurrection of Christ,—and in its fitness to supply our own spiritual need, that the supposed facts are real, and the teaching is true. Thus our grammatical study of the Greek Testament will contribute both to Systematic Theology and to the Evidences of Christianity.

The prominence given to this practical application of New Testament exegesis is a special and distinguishing feature of my own commentaries. In my earlier volumes I have given special attention to the meaning of the words used by St. Paul; in all of them I have endeavoured to trace his line of thought, and to bring out its value as an evidence of the truth of the gospel; and in the volume lately published on the Epistles to the *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, and *Colossians*, I have endeavoured, after a careful exposition, to reproduce St. Paul's conception of the Church, of Christ, and of the Gospel.

Of all the letters written by St. Paul, of all the products of human thought, there is none better fitted to raise us above the tumult around, to sit with Christ in heavenly places, than the sublime Epistle to the Ephesians.

Note on Gen. i. 2, 3.

"Darkness was upon the face of the deep. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light."

THIS passage is the consummation of the whole revelation of the grace of God. And in face of the objections made to the early chapters of Genesis, it is worth while to notice, as an encouragement to faith, this continuity and completeness of the revelation made in the history of the old world before the flood.

I. DARKNESS.—Notice the stages of the history. Chap. i. contains the story of the *Creation* (of the world and life). Chap. ii., the *conservation* in God's providential arrangements. Chap. iii., the *corruption*. Chap. iv., the *consequence* immediate on the corruption, viz., the violation of family life. Chap. v. is a *cemetery*, showing the further developments of the corruption, and containing one bright tombstone (v. 24). Chap. vi., the *conflict* between God and sin. Chap. vii., the *condemnation* of the world for sin.

II. GOD SAID, LET THERE BE LIGHT.—In each chapter we have a promise of brightness coming. In i., by the creation of light; in ii., by the picture of paradise; in iii., by the promise of the Messiah, vers. 15, 21; in iv., by the accepted sacrifice; in v., by the hope of immortality (v. 24); in vi., by the building of the ark; in vii., by the safety in the ark.

III. AND THERE WAS LIGHT.—Our general thanksgiving sums up the chapters in this aspect. We may thank God for Creation (i.), preservation and blessings of this life (ii.), the redemption of the world (iii. 15), the means of grace (iv. 4), the hope of glory (v. 24). And then we may pray God to enable us to serve Him in our lives, by walking in holiness and righteousness, of which we have an example in Noah (vi., vii.).

E. ABBEY TINDALL.

Recent Literature in Sermons.

A GUIDE TO THE BUYING OF BOOKS.

PUBLISHERS.	*AUTHOR AND TITLE.*	*NOTES.*
ALEXANDER & SHEPHEARD, 21 Furnival Street, Holborn.	THE HOLY OF HOLIES. Sermons on the 14th, 15th, and 16th Chapters of the Gospel of St. John. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. Cr. 8vo, pp. xii., 379. 1890. 5s.	It is a pleasure to have such a volume as Dr. Maclaren's "Holy of Holies," with which to open an article on "Recent Literature in Sermons." It is well printed and well bound, and it contains thirty-four grand Sermons. This is the tenth volume which Dr. Maclaren has issued, and it is just those who have the others who will most surely order this. Dr. Maclaren is so true and candid an expositor that his work is always instructive and always invigorating.
BIBLE CHRISTIAN BOOK ROOM, 26 Paternoster Row.	THE WELSH PULPIT OF TO-DAY. Sermons by Welsh Ministers. First Series. Edited by the Rev. J. Cynddylan Jones. Cr. 8vo, pp. xxviii., 450. 7s. 6d.	"The Welsh Pulpit of To-day" contains twenty-seven Sermons by twenty-six prominent Welsh preachers of different denominations. Dr. Lewis Edwards is the author of two, and among those who contribute one are Principal T. C. Edwards, Principal Jayne, and Dr. Rees Thomas. The sermons were preached in Welsh, the translation into English being for the most part by the editor, who is known as the author of "Studies in Matthew," and other works. His "Introductory Essay" in this volume gives a spirited estimate of the present position of the Welsh pulpit. The names of the authors will speak for the quality of the sermons. There is Welsh fire, and there is wisdom with it.
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160 Fleet Street.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. Volume XXIX. January to June 1890. Royal 8vo, pp. 312. 1890.	We have to do here only with the Sermons, which form, however, the most important part of this volume, there being two or three in each weekly (1d.) part. The variety is very great, so that it is impossible to characterise them as a whole. Let it suffice to mention the following names:—Archdeacon Farrar, Bishop Westcott, Canon Duckworth, Canon Liddon, Dr. Paget, Dr. Phillips Brooks, Prebendary Gibson, Prebendary Bassett.
JAMES CLARKE & Co., 13 and 14 Fleet Street.	NEW POINTS TO OLD TEXTS. By James Morris Whiton, Ph.D., Minister of Trinity Congregational Church in New York. Author of "The Law of Liberty." Cr. 8vo, pp. 255. 1889. 3s. 6d.	There is a modern ring about the Sermons in "New Points to Old Texts" which will make them welcome to many readers. A typical sentence is this: "As the range of knowledge expands, the range of the miraculous narrows." There is independence and novelty in the handling of the subjects as well as the texts, as when the idea is worked out that Elisha was no prophet, but "a wily politician." Evolution and modern criticism make their presence felt, and Dr. Whiton adds the touch of a living expositor.
T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh.	THE VOICE FROM THE CROSS. A Series of Sermons on the Lord's Passion. By Eminent Living Preachers of Germany, including Ahlfeld, Frommel, Luthardt, Stöcker, and Teichmüller. Edited and Translated by William Macintosh, M.A., F.S.S. Cr. 8vo, pp. 265. 1888. 5s.	Canon Battersby used to say that the best corrective to German Rationalism was an acquaintance with the evangelical writers of Germany. This volume will serve the purpose. It contains twenty Sermons by preachers whose fame is in all the churches. They are Evangelical all, yet their attitude is not that which is most familiar to us, and numerous fresh points and striking thoughts are found in the book. It has a short, well-informed Introduction, and an Appendix of Biographical Notices by the Editor. Those who turn to this volume for Lenten reading, or other devotional purposes, will find a rich spiritual reward.
RICHARD D. DICKINSON, 89 Farringdon Street.	THE BLIND MAN'S CREED, and other Sermons. By Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D., Pastor of the Madison Square Church, New York. Cr. 8vo, pp. 246. 1890. 3s. 6d.	There is no obtrusion of doctrine in this volume, no topical divisions, no effort at eloquence. The texts chosen are practical and, it may be added, picturesque; and we have then sixteen attractive, well-informed talks upon the subjects suggested by them. They are *interesting* discourses, in the best sense of that somewhat abused word.

PUBLISHERS.	*AUTHOR AND TITLE.*	*NOTES.*
Funk & Wagnalls, 44 Fleet Street.	THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA; or, Worldliness in the Church. By Howard Crosby, Pastor of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. 12mo, pp. 168. 1890. 2s. 6d.	The sub-title of Dr. Crosby's little book tells what it is he finds in the Epistles to the Seven Churches. It is a warning against "the fearful peril of allowing the world to come into alliance with the Church." In the spirit of a careful expositor this warning lesson is drawn out of the seven Epistles in a series of seven brief, simple discourses; and an eighth discourse finds the same lesson in the history of the Church.
The Same.	THE CALVARY PULPIT: Christ and Him Crucified. By Robert S. MacArthur. Cr. 8vo, pp. 294. 1890. 3s. 6d.	The twenty-two Sermons in this volume were preached in the Calvary Baptist Church, New York, whence the name. A book which opens, as this does, with the text, "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified," stamps its character at once. There is much spirit and resource shown in the handling of the "grand old doctrines." The last thing one would charge upon Mr. MacArthur is dulness.
Hodder & Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row.	PROFESSOR W. G. ELMSLIE, D.D. Memoir and Sermons. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D., and A. N. Macnicoll. With Portrait. Cr. 8vo, pp. xii., 327. 1890. 6s.	The combination of Memoir and Sermons may never be the happiest. In this case the main objection to it is that thereby we are deprived of that which everyone must desire—more of both. There are fourteen Sermons, two Bible Readings, and a paper on the First Chapter of Genesis. The great characteristic of the Sermons is their restraint. Pent-up energy, spiritual and mental, is here, for others perhaps to dissipate. The Sermon on the "Making of a prophet" not only shows how one prophet, Isaiah, was made, but itself is fit, in God's hands, for the making of prophets.
The Same.	MEMORIALS OF EDWIN HATCH, D.D., sometime Reader in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Rector of Purleigh. Edited by his Brother. Cr. 8vo, pp. xliii., 336. 1890. 7s. 6d.	These "Memorials" consist of twenty-five Sermons, preceded by selected Biographical Notices. They are mostly Oxford Sermons, but there is no constraint or consciousness of this. Whether in St. Mary's, Oxford, or in the Cathedral of Quebec, Dr. Hatch is himself; and he gives himself, his very life, in these Sermons. "He fought his doubts and gathered strength." And now he will impart that strength—lead us to the secret of it—for our daily blessing. For life is a conflict, and we must win our own souls. He arrests the mind at once by a direct appeal to some hunger or thirst; he casts a rapid glance around at futile attempts to satisfy it; and then leads with firm step to the presence of God. "That is the soul's satisfaction—to realise the presence of God. The other name for it is faith. It is the seeing of Him who is invisible."
The Same.	SELECTED SERMONS OF SCHLEIERMACHER. Translated by Mary F. Wilson. Cr. 8vo, pp. viii., 451. 1890. 7s. 6d.	Schleiermacher is a long name and suspiciously German, so that it is not every one who will want to make that "public reference to a man of note" which the writer of the Biographical Sketch in this volume expects. But practice makes the longest German word come easily. It is the suspicion that needs removal, and that may be removed by this admirable sketch, if it has not been already effected by Lichtenberger's magnificent exposition. But the best antidote is the sermons themselves. There are twenty-seven in the volume. Take the fourth, on John iii.—"Necessity of the New Birth." Is it not fundamental? Yet there is neither haziness nor indecision. "Every one must first have tasted the life of corruption, and then, by the second act of Divine omnipotence and love, he is born of the Spirit and becomes spirit. We have all, as Christians, an invincible and inalienable consciousness of this transformation." As for other matters, the book is instructive, for we have yet much to learn from the great preachers of Germany, and it is very well rendered in English.

PUBLISHERS.	*AUTHOR AND TITLE.*	*NOTES.*
HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27 Paternoster Row.	**THE GREAT ALTERNATIVE, and other Sermons. By the Rev. Charles Moinet, M.A., Kensington. Cr. 8vo, pp. vii., 292. 1890. 6s.**	"The Great Alternative" contains eighteen Sermons of an exceptional character. Each of the texts which Mr. Moinet has chosen holds some great principle or truth. It may not be on the surface, but it is essential. This truth or thought, which is never fantastic and never secondary, but always central, Mr. Moinet makes his own. If it is hidden in the wording, he gives convincing reasons for his interpretation. By analogy and illustration, and by the command of a distinctive English style, it becomes clear and telling; it is seen, it is felt, often it is made to stand in the way like a living, pleading presence, which we cannot pass by without being the worse for it.
THE SAME.	**SHEAVES OF MINISTRY: Sermons and Expositions. By James Morison, D.D. 8vo, pp. viii., 394. 1890. 10s. 6d.**	The true expositor must be a theologian, the theologian must be an expositor, and the preacher must be both. He must be both and something more. Dr. Morison is a theologian, we knew long since; he is also a famous expositor; and now it is open to all to see that he has that additional personal persuasive thing which makes him a preacher. "Sheaves of Ministry" is a handsome volume to look to, and it contains thirty-four Sermons, chosen out of a ministry of fifty years. It is not one sermon in the year; surely we all can write *one* good sermon in the year. It is probable that Dr. Morison wrote many, and that the great difficulty was the selection. The sermons have certain marked characteristics. First, they are expository, which preserves to them a fresh and modern flavour; next, the exposition is massed together into great controlling doctrines; and the direct appeal is felt throughout, in clear statement, short sentence, distinct and progressive division.
THE SAME.	**SOME CENTRAL POINTS OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY. By Henry Wace, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral; Principal of King's College, London. Cr. 8vo, pp. xv., 352. 1890. 6s.**	The first reading of these Discourses may possibly be disappointing. But perceive Dr. Wace's purpose, and then follow carefully the working out of it, and that feeling will disappear. His purpose is "to realise the actual circumstances of certain of our Lord's sayings and doings, and to appreciate their original native significance." Therefore, the watchwords of modern criticism, and the nomenclature of traditional theology, are equally absent. There is a simplicity throughout—the simplicity, as it were, of early impressions—which misleads an unwary reader—not into misunderstanding of the acts and words of Christ, rather the reverse of that, but into depreciation of the actual worth of the Sermons.
C. H. KELLY, 2 Castle Street, City Road.	**LESSONS OF PROSPERITY, and other Addresses. Delivered at Noonday in the Philosophical Hall, Leeds. By the Rev. W. L. Watkinson. Cr. 8vo, pp. 180. 1890. 1s. 6d.**	"Lessons of Prosperity" is the title and subject of the first only of these fifteen Addresses, but the rest are in keeping. They were delivered to a city audience, and they treat of the conduct of life in the city. Direct in speech, yet never irritating; mindful of the hard present, with its grinding selfishness and fiercely tempting competitions, yet always sympathetic, always encouraging. Mr. Watkinson's advice is practical as that of the Baptist, but he knows another baptism than that of John. In the first volume of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (pp. 46, 71) there may be found two striking examples of Mr. Watkinson's thought and language.
THE SAME.	**NOONDAY ADDRESSES. Delivered in the Central Hall, Manchester. By the Rev. W. L. Watkinson. Cr. 8vo, pp. 184. 1890. 1s. 6d.**	Of these sixteen "Noonday Addresses" the first six are upon 1 Cor. iii. 21–23, and give the fullest and best exposition of that great text in modern times. The rest of the volume touches upon our present life at several points and turning-points, making the grace of God that bringeth salvation to bear upon them all, whereby the moralities of life are encouraged to become true sanctities.

PUBLISHERS.	*AUTHOR AND TITLE.*	*NOTES.*
C. H. KELLY, 2 Castle Street, City Road.	THE PREACHER'S MAGAZINE. For Preachers, Teachers, and Bible Students. Editors: Mark Guy Pearse; Arthur E. Gregory. Vol. i. 8vo, pp. 572. 1890. 5s.	For homiletical purposes, the *Preacher's Magazine* is the best we see. Its leading monthly features are—(1) A picked Sermon by a great preacher; (2) An Exposition by Mark Guy Pearse; (3) An Article by Professor Findlay on the Study of the Bible; (4) Short Doctrinal Papers by J. R. Gregory; (5) A Sketch, under the title of "The Minister's Study," by W. J. Dawson; (6) Matthew Henry made Easy; and (7) A large number of short Homiletical Notes and Outlines. Such is its regular fare, and it is served with unfailing freshness and skill. Twice during this year the opening Sermon was, in our judgment, the finest the month produced.
JOHN KENSIT, City Protestant Book Depôt, 18 Paternoster Row.	THE CITY PULPIT: Sermons by the Rev. E. A. Stuart, M.A., Vicar of St. James', Holloway. Vol. iv. Post 8vo, pp. 240. 1890. 2s. 6d.	With five exceptions, the thirty-six Sermons which this volume contains were delivered in St. Mary-le-Bow Church, Cheapside, on Thursday afternoons. The date of the first is October 5, 1889, and of the last June 5, 1890. They seem to be reports of extemporaneous Addresses. The personal, direct, face-to-face appeal makes itself felt in every sentence. The personality of the speaker—evidently an intensely earnest missionary personality—breathes in every line. The sermons are short; they are thoroughly, absorbingly evangelical; they are not weighted with thought, but they flash fire to kindle enthusiastic service. This volume of sermons is one of the cheapest issued.
LONGMANS & Co., 39 Paternoster Row.	THE MAGNIFICAT: Sermons in St. Paul's, August, 1889. By H. P. Liddon, D.D. Cr. 8vo, pp. 112. 1890. 2s. 6d.	These sermons on "The Magnificat" were noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. i. p. 89) immediately upon their publication. It was then said: "Whoever wishes to understand Mary's beautiful hymn of praise should read four sermons which Canon Liddon has delivered. They are truly great sermons."
THE SAME.	FACULTIES AND DIFFICULTIES FOR BELIEF AND DISBELIEF. By the Rev. Francis Paget, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology. Cr. 8vo, pp. 292. 2nd ed. 1890. 6s. 6d.	In the Preface to the first edition of "Faculties and Difficulties" Dr. Paget said: "My best hope in this venture of publication is that I may perhaps suggest to some others the lines of thought which I have learnt from my masters." That sentence characterises the volume. The sermons are apologetic. They are addressed to a distinct class—the class of *non-believers*—not the atheistic, the infidel, or the clearly and complacently agnostic classes, but to those who are living "in the twilight—irresolute, discouraged, disabled for the act of faith, more and more inclined to order their life without reference to claims which they cannot absolutely deny." It is an intelligent class of men, and Dr. Paget's aim is to suggest to them lines of thought—for which he claims no originality (less indeed than is his due) which he has learnt, he says, from Mozley, Newman, Liddon, Church—by which perchance they may be led out of the dim twilight, as he himself has been. The book is divided into two parts, with ten Sermons in the one part and nine in the other. The first part traces the Faculties we possess for Belief; the second points out the Difficulties that cling to Disbelief. External proofs alone never win belief, but we have within us certain faculties or desires, needs, instincts; and when the external evidence and the internal need meet together, belief is born. Such a book, when well done, always succeeds; and Dr. Paget has certainly done this well, and his book will probably see more editions yet.
MACMILLAN & Co., 29 Bedford Street.	FOR CHRIST AND CITY! Liverpool Sermons and Addresses. By Charles William Stubbs, M.A., Rector of Wavertree. Cr. 8vo, pp. 208. 1890. 6s.	"For Christ and City" is not strictly a volume of Sermons. Though there are texts they are mostly well-chosen mottoes for Addresses and Lectures. Frederick Denison Maurice is the subject of one of these lectures—a lecture brimful of sympathy and reverence. Other titles are, "The Social Creed of the Church," "The English Church and Historic Continuity," "Church Comprehension and Reform." They are all living issues. Mr. Stubbs, it is well known, has taken his stand in the centre of the realities of life. With a knowledge of its depths as well as its heights, he claims the city for Christ.

PUBLISHERS.	*AUTHOR AND TITLE.*	*NOTES.*
Macmillan & Co., 29 Bedford Street.	ORDINATION ADDRESSES AND COUNSELS TO CLERGY. By the late Joseph Barber Lightfoot, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. Cr. 8vo, pp. xii., 318. 1890. 6s.	No one can approach a new volume by Bishop Lightfoot altogether free from bias. We owe him so much, we are very willing to owe him more. But this volume of "Ordination Addresses" needs no favourable inclination. It contains nine charges to ordination candidates and fourteen counsels to clergy, all the fruit of his ten years' episcopate. The counsels being more academical are not so far removed from the line of Dr. Lightfoot's previous work as an Expositor and Divinity Lecturer. They may be described indeed as expository studies with a practical and personal application; and there is some very fine exegetical work in them. But, in the charges, Dr. Lightfoot is seen in a new attitude. The exegete is not absent, but he is here only to support and strengthen the ambassador for Christ. The ambassador, the Christian prophet, "bubbling over" with a most urgent and imperious message, absorbs the attention, and almost dominates the will. If the counsels are treasures of academic wisdom, the impressive eloquence of these charges has scarcely a rival in the literature of pastoral theology.
The Same.	LEADERS IN THE NORTHERN CHURCH: Sermons preached in the Diocese of Durham. By the late Joseph Barber Lightfoot, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. Cr. 8vo, pp. xii., 204. 1890. 6s.	For many years past it had been Bishop Lightfoot's intention to publish, some time or other, a volume of Sermons bearing upon the history of the Diocese of Durham. A memorandum in his handwriting gives the whole Series sketched out as follows:—(1) The Celtic Mission of Iona and Lindisfarne; (2) St. Columba; (3) St. Oswald; (4) St. Aidan; (5) St. Hilda; (6) St. Cuthbert; (7) The Life of Bede; (8) The Death of Bede; (9) Benedict Biscop; (10) Antony Bek; (11) Richard D. Bury; (12) Bernard Gilpin; (13) John Cosin; (14) Joseph Butler. Of these proposed sermons, the second, seventh, ninth, and tenth were never written. In the present volume, which has been edited for the Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund by the Rev. J. R. Harmer, M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Chaplain to the late Bishop, the Series is now given to the world in its incomplete form, and a few notes have been added in illustration of some of the historical allusions. Mr. Harmer has done his work with judgment and restraint.
The Same.	STONES FROM THE QUARRY: A Volume of Sermons. By the Rev. Robert Vaughan, Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, South Shields. Cr. 8vo, pp. x., 220. 1890. 5s.	Whether or not the title, "Stones from the Quarry," is chosen to suggest a scientific aspect in these Sermons, there is no doubt that they do possess a distinction which we may describe as scientific. Not that they have to do with the questions between religion and science. The first alone, a special sermon, preached on the occasion of the visit to Newcastle of the British Association, deals with a subject distinctly lying there. All the rest, eighteen in number, have quite usual typical texts, out of which they flow by the most legitimate process of exposition. But there is a scientific tone, the tone of a mind trained in exact methods, in every one of them. Large vision, clear thought, appropriate language, orderly arrangement—these are their characteristics. They are very fine examples of the sermon that teaches.
James Maclehose & Sons, Publishers to the University, Glasgow.	THE SALVATION OF THE GOSPEL: A Series of Discourses. By Rev. Robert T. Jeffrey, M.D., Minister of Caledonian Road Church, Glasgow. With Portrait. Cr. 8vo, pp. 411. 1890. 6s.	Professor Henry Drummond, in a recent Address on Missions, said that there were two ways in which men who went to the mission field regarded the world. The first view was, that the world was lost and must be saved; the second, the world was sunken and must be raised. The first was the standpoint of popular Evangelism, the second the view of Christian Evolution. The first of these views is Dr. Jeffrey's, and it could not be more briefly described. He knows nothing of the standpoint of Christian Evolution, he preaches the old and popular Evangelism of salvation for a lost and ruined world. There are sixteen Sermons in the volume, and the title and the text of every one of them contains the word "Salvation." It is a promising sign when a great congregation asks for the publication of Discourses such as these are.

PUBLISHERS.	*AUTHOR AND TITLE.*	*NOTES.*
James Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners Street.	GOSPEL SERMONS. By James M'Cosh, D.D., LL.D., Litt. D., Ex-President of Princeton College. Cr. 8vo, pp. 336. 1888. 6s.	A volume containing no more than eighteen Sermons, chosen from the whole life's preaching of a man of Dr. M'Cosh's mental and spiritual capacity, ought to be worth the buying. And it is. The name is perhaps challengeable, since every man believes that he preaches a gospel. "Evangelical" would have been less questionable, more's the pity. Dr. M'Cosh has been for many years an American, and a preacher in America; he was for some years a preacher in Ireland; but these sermons are neither Irish nor American. Wheresoever preached, they are examples of the Scottish pulpit—of that pulpit in the days which came after the Disruption, and they are as typical examples of it as will anywhere be found. They are great doctrinal discourses, worthy to represent a great religious crisis.
The Same.	REGENT SQUARE PULPIT. Sermons by the Rev. John M'Neill. Vol. ii. Cr. 8vo, pp. 416. 1890. 3s. 6d.	This second volume of Mr. M'Neill's Sermons is issued without a word of preface or introduction. The Sermons speak for themselves. The character of the first is the character of the last, and it is recognised on the opening page: "Come now and let us converse together, and the topic shall be some Bible incident." And so it is a familiar conversation always, let the incident be the Rapture of Elijah, or the Woman at the Well, the Choice of Solomon, or the Great Refusal. The preacher leads, but he does not absorb the conversation; that the congregation is taking some share in it is felt always. It is an interesting conversation, at rare intervals somewhat depressing, more often lifting up to clear insight and earnest self-forgetful endeavour. They who have heard the man will most appreciate the book.
The Same.	THE COVENANT OF PEACE. By Marvin R. Vincent, D.D., Author of "Word Studies in the New Testament." Cr. 8vo, pp. 316. 6s.	Dr. Marvin Vincent has already been spoken of in The Expository Times as the author of one of the best volumes of American sermons published in this country. This volume is scarcely inferior to that. There is both unity of aim and variety of subject in its twenty Sermons. Its appeal is to Christians; its aim to lift them out of certain popular misconceptions of duty, and to strengthen them under certain painful phases of experience. Dr. Vincent is a man of culture, and his sympathy is wide, but his faith is clear and confident. For souls fighting for life and victory, under the burden of infirmity and the sting of sorrow, there is help here.
The Same.	HARVEST THANKSGIVING SERVICES: Sermons and Outline Addresses, by the Rev. Hugh Macmillan, D.D., LL.D., Rev. J. Monro Gibson, D.D., Rev. Gordon Calthrop, M.A., Rev. Henry Allon, D.D., Rev. W. J. Dawson, and others. Cr. 8vo, pp. 228. 1890. 5s.	This volume contains thirteen complete Sermons, eleven Sketches of Sermons, and three Addresses. They have all been delivered probably at Harvest Thanksgiving or Flower Services. That season is over; but men should note the volume, one of the most helpful for such services. Indeed, some of the sermons lead to so sympathetic an insight into the beauty and the gift of nature that the helpfulness of the book is independent of times and seasons. Besides the authors named on the title-page there are other favourites, of whom the Rev. W. L. Watkinson is one.
Passmore & Alabaster, 4 Paternoster Buildings.	THE METROPOLITAN TABERNACLE PULPIT. Sermons by C. H. Spurgeon. Vol. 36. 8vo. 1890. 7s.	*The Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit* went beyond the two thousandth number in weekly issue some time ago. Yet in this volume there is visible neither weakening of interest nor loss of power.
Elliot Stock, 62 Paternoster Row.	THE WEEKLY PULPIT: A Series of Suggestive Sermons, Outlines, Critical and Homiletical Notes, Illustrations, or Addresses, for the use of Preachers. Volume i., New Series. Cr. 8vo, pp. 312. 1890. 2s. 6d.	The title-page of this volume frankly describes its purpose. Let preachers use it frankly. It seems scarcely possible to write sermons for this special and sole purpose; yet most of the sermons here are original, and there is vitality in them. But probably the most immediately helpful thing will be the illustrative quotations which, under the name of "Purple Patches," are found on every twelfth page; they are very good indeed.

PUBLISHERS.	AUTHOR AND TITLE.	NOTES.
Elliot Stock, 62 Paternoster Row.	**A LETTER FROM HEAVEN, and other Sermons. By the Rev. David Roberts, D.D., Wrexham. Being a translation into English of selected Sermons previously published in the Welsh language by the Author. Cr. 8vo, pp. 224. 1890. 5s.**	Few sermons will bear translation; perhaps few deserve it. The Sermons in Dr. Roberts' volume must have been difficult to translate, for their quality depends not a little upon nicety of expression. Still, they seem to come out of it well. No one will deny that they deserve it. They remind one not a little—though imitation is out of the question on either side—of the sermons of another Celt, Mr. Mark Guy Pearse. Might he not have said this? "When the Scriptures mention how good men and bad men fall in the presence of the Lord, there is a significant difference—the good fall on their faces, nearer to Him; and the bad fall backwards, further from Him." It is a volume for the preacher, full of thoughtful and fertile exposition.

Exegetical Papers.

Note upon Ephesians ii. 14.

"Hath broken down the middle wall of partition," or rather, "the middle wall of the enclosure."

Φραγμὸς would seem to imply that the fence was more or less transitory or temporary, to be removed at the will of the owner.

The allusion may be either—

a. To the wall built between the Gentile and Jewish courts in the temple; or,

b. To the veil screening off the Holiest of Holies; or,

c. To the safeguards mentioned in Ps. lxxx., which separated off their own land from the nations around them—or all of them.

Now, the object of Jesus Christ in breaking down this wall is to effect an union, wider and greater than could possibly take place under the old conditions.

How accomplished—*the Incarnation* the first step; the junction of human and divine, God and man united. Here are two so long separated united in one.

The breaking down the barrier of death by His own dying and resurrection. We know now the living and dead are only two states of man's existence.

The breaking down the mountain of guiltiness before God by His own personal sacrifice; the perfect surrender of body and soul and spirit to the will of God—God's justice is satisfied, man's acceptance secured.

The breaking down the ceremonial law; it had served its purpose; a wider plan, a nobler ideal must now take its place—not minute ceremonies but deep abiding principles—not one temple but the wide world He is to be worshipped in.

The breaking down the special Jewish privileges and flinging wide open the gates of salvation to a ransomed world, united to Him by covenant, by faith, by sacraments; as a mighty band of brothers are we to move on into His eternal presence.

Alfred Gill.

Exposition of Ephesians iii. 15.

"Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

In this passage there are three points which call for notice,—

(1) The phrase "of whom," which is in the Greek ἐξ οὗ, literally "out of whom," R.V. "from whom." οὗ here refers to πατέρα in v. 14, which, according to the best authorities, closes that verse—the phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. of the *Textus Receptus* being an addition. The name borne by πᾶσα πατριὰ is derived from God as Father. His Fatherhood is its source.

(2) The word πατριὰ itself calls for attention. It occurs three times in the New Testament—St. Luke ii. 4, Acts iii. 25, Eph. iii. 15 (the present passage), and is always rendered by the R.V. "family" or "families." In the margin the Greek is there said to mean "Fatherhood." An attempt is thus made to show the English reader the verbal connection between πατέρα (v. 14) and πατριὰ. In the LXX. πατριὰ is often used for the Hebrew מִשְׁפָּחָה (cf. Ex. vi. 15; Lev. xxv. 10; Ps. xxi. 30, etc.).

(3) "The whole family." A question of translation underlies the interpretation of this phrase, and so of the whole passage. The adjective (πᾶσα) translated in A.V. "whole," usually means "every" when it is used without the article, as it is here, and "all"—"the whole of the object which it qualifies"—when the article is used. Accordingly, the R.V., with the support of many commentators both ancient and modern, translates πᾶσα πατριὰ "every family;" and (i.) the meaning

of the whole passage when thus rendered appears to be that the Fatherhood of God is the source from which every other father draws his fatherhood, —its name and idea. From the Universal Father every family, ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, with its head (father), derives its name. (ii.) Some scholars favour the rendering of the A.V., asserting that the usage of the adjective indicated above does not always apply in the New Testament. Chap. ii. 21, where the best critics read πᾶσα without the article, is adduced, but this passage is not decisive. If we adopt the rendering "whole family," which would make the grammar of the original contrary to classical usage, the meaning of the Apostle will be that the whole family of angels (in heaven), and of the spirits of just men, if heaven may here include Paradise, and of truly Christian men (on earth), is one under the great spiritual Father, from whom the name of children is derived—children in His one family. It is said that this view—or one akin to it—is more in keeping with the context than (i.), but it seems to us to fall short of the Apostle's meaning. It seems a fuller and grander conception to think of every family in heaven and earth (angels and men) as drawing their several fatherhoods from the Fatherhood of Him whose offspring man is (Acts xvii. 28, 29)—the gracious All-Father.

F. M'KENZIE.

The Religious Literature of the Month.

BOOKS.

MESSRS. MACMILLAN have just issued the new edition of **S. Clement,** which the late Bishop Lightfoot had substantially completed before his death, and which forms Part I. of his Commentary on the Apostolic Fathers. This new edition is in two handsome volumes, and contains the Appendix of 1877 worked up into a whole with the original edition of 1869. Three new essays are added: "Clement the Doctor," "Early Roman Succession," and "Hippolytus," together with an autotype facsimile of the Constantinople MS. Bishop Westcott contributes a short preface (8vo, 32s.) From Messrs. Macmillan come also two volumes of **Sermons** by the late Bishop of Durham, noticed elsewhere.

MR. FISHER UNWIN has published a new edition (8vo, 7s. 6d.) of **The Two Kinds of Truth** (noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. i. p. 263), with an Introduction, which should have accompanied the first edition, it is so lucid and guiding.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK have published the second and last volume of **Delitzsch's Isaiah** (8vo, 10s. 6d.), translated by Professor Banks and the Rev. James Kennedy, B.D.; and the last volume of **Schürer's Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ** (8vo, 10s. 6d.), translated by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A.

From MESSRS. LONGMANS we receive **Canon Luckock's The Intermediate State between Death and Judgment** (crown 8vo, 6s.).

MESSRS. HODDER & STOUGHTON have issued a new volume of **Professor Agar Beet's Commentaries** — Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon (crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.). We have already marked our estimate of this volume by placing it in the "Guild."

From the RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY there come two additions to the Bypaths of Bible Knowledge Series, viz., **Early Bible Songs** (crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.), and **Modern Discoveries on the Site of Ancient Ephesus** (crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.). The former is by the Rev. A. H. Drysdale, M.A., the latter is abridged, with access to additional MSS., from the late Mr. J. T. Wood's volume on the subject, long since out of print.

MESSRS. CASSELL & COMPANY have sent **Signa Christi:** Evidences of Christianity set forth in the Person and Work of Christ, by the Rev. James Aitchison, M.A., Minister of Erskine Church, Falkirk (cr. 8vo, 5s.); and **Bishop Barry's Lectures on Christianity and Socialism** (crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.).

MR. C. H. KELLY (the Wesleyan Methodist Book-Room) sends **The Mission of Methodism,** being the Fernley Lecture for 1890, by the Rev. Richard Green (8vo, 3s.).

MESSRS. D. WYLIE & SON, Aberdeen, have issued a new and cheaper edition of **Dr. Stewart's The Divinity of Christ** (crown 8vo, 1s.).

From Glasgow (London: A. W. SHEARING, Exeter Hall) we have the yearly volume of **The Guide** for 1890. Sub-title: A Help to Personal Progress (4to, 2s.).

MR. B. T. BATSFORD, 52 High Holborn, has published **Three Christian Tests** — The "Germ" Test, the "Color" Test, the "Brotherhood" Test—(crown 8vo, 1s.).

From the CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS comes another volume of the "Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools," **The Acts of the Apostles,** edited by Dr. Rawson Lumby (1s.)

MR. THIN, Publisher to the University, Edinburgh, has sent out a translation into English metre of **The Book of Job and the Song of Solomon,** by "Talmid." Another Rendering of the **Song of Songs** is by the Rev. W. C. Daland, M.A., of Leonardsville, N.Y.

The following pamphlets are worthy of notice:—**A Life Story,** by the Rev. Frederick Whitfield, M.A. (Nisbet, 2d.); **From the Deluge to the Christian Era,** by the Rev. Theodore Budd (Norwich: Fletcher & Son); **The late Professor Evans:** A Sketch by H. J. R. Marston, M.A. (Durham: "Advertiser" Office, 3d.); **Cardinal Newman and his other Gospel,** by the Rev. R. M'Cheyne Edgar, M.A. (Dublin: Humphrey & Armour, 4d.); **The Sure and Certain Hope,** by the Rev. H. Whittaker (Partridge & Co., 1d.); **The Pneumatomachy of the Day,** by Charles Ingham Black, D.D. (Skeffington & Son); **God or Self?** by the Rev. Samuel M'Comb, B.D. (Elliot Stock); and **The Evangelical Faith,** by the Rev. Marshall Lang, D.D., the Rev. John Smith, M.A., and the Rev. John M'Neill (Aberdeen Y.M.C.A., 1d.).

MAGAZINES.

The Devout Jew.

THE BAPTIST MAGAZINE has an important article by the late Dr. Trestrail on "The Position and Prospects of the Jews." Dr. Trestrail does not doubt that there is salvation for the Jew who holds fast to Moses and the Prophets. "Extinguish this hope, and we begin to cherish fears of the safety of the godly patriarchs and prophets. Neither must we forget that the ground of pardon and justification in the sight of God is the same in both Dispensations, and that 'in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted by Him.'"

The Ethical Theory of Messianic Prophecy.

"Non multa sed multum" is the motto of the CANADIAN METHODIST QUARTERLY this time. There are only three articles and a few book notices in this substantial volume. The place of honour and most of the space is given to an article on "Messianic Prophecy," by Professor G. C. Workman, who is known on this side by his scholarly book, *The Text of Jeremiah*. Dr. Workman describes the theory which he discusses and expounds as the "Ethical Theory of Messianic Prophecy." "In the Book of Revelation (xix. 10), the writer significantly says, 'The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.' This pregnant statement is all important for the purpose of helping us to obtain a true conception of the aim and soul of prophecy. The spirit of prophecy is not *prediction*, but *testimony;* and the spirit of the Old and New Testament prophecy alike is the *testimony* of Jesus Christ. As the Divine Spirit was the efficient cause of prophecy, so the coming Messiah was its essential theme. Therefore the spiritual witness or testimony borne to Jesus, as its fundamental theme, is the sum and substance of Messianic Prophecy."

A Theology in Stone.

To the Christmas Number of the ENGLISH ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE Archdeacon Farrar contributes an article under the title of "Nooks and Corners in Westminster Abbey," and it is most admirably and characteristically illustrated by Herbert Railton. After quoting from Walpole, Burke, Waller, Jeremy Taylor, Congreve, Watts, Scott, Voltaire, and Macaulay, Dr. Farrar says:—"But it is evident that one great fact about the Abbey had been for generations forgotten or overlooked, since neither these visitors nor any others allude to it. Yet that fact was absolutely predominant in the minds of the original builders. It is that the Abbey is meant to be *a theology in stone*. Of the myriads who yearly enter it, probably not one in a thousand intelligently appreciates the sacred symbolism of the building, or catches the intention of its structure. That intention was to convey, predominantly, the two great central truths of Christianity —the Trinity and the Atonement; and, subordinately, the other main doctrines of the Creed. This, and nothing less than this, is the significance of the triple length—nave, choir, sacrarium; of the triple width—aisle, nave, aisle; of the triple height—arch, triforium, clerestory. And to fill the minds of the worshippers with the thought of the Incarnation and Death of Christ, it was built, as Matthew Paris says, "*novo compositionis genere*," namely, cruciform.

"The Hereafter."

In the EXPOSITOR Professor Agar Beet concludes his articles on "the Future Punishment of Sin." After noticing a number of books, he gives testimony to the worth of Fyfe's "The Hereafter," saying, "I heartily recommend his book as by far the best on this supremely difficult subject." Mr. Beet touches upon a subject which demands investigation at present, but needs most careful handling. We mean—

Life and Immortality.

"That human consciousness will not cease at death is plainly taught, and everywhere assumed, throughout the New Testament. In this sense, the soul of man may be said to be immortal; it will not be dissipated by the stroke of death. But from this, and from the teaching of the New Testament about the endless blessedness of the saved and about the sufferings of the lost, many have inferred and have asserted that the soul of man is by its own nature and constitution indissoluble, that human consciousness is, except in such intervals as sleep, essentially permanent; and this assertion has been used as an argument to prove the endlessness of the sufferings of the lost. But it is worthy of note that such argument is never used in the Bible. Man is said in Genesis to have become, at his creation, 'a living soul.' But we are never taught, in so many words or in words equivalent, that the life then given is an inalienable possession. The introduction of this argument, foreign as it is to the thought of Holy Scripture, has greatly complicated the subject before us.

"This complication is the more serious, because, in the New Testament *life* means much more than conscious existence. Wherever this word refers to existence beyond the grave, it denotes the normal and blessed state of the servants of God. The future state of the lost is never spoken of as *life*. Even while living on earth, the wicked are said to be 'dead';

'he that disobeys the Son will not see life'; the doom of the unsaved is 'the second death'; immortality is the reward of well-doing. Consequently, they who speak of the soul of man as essentially immortal, and of the lost as living for ever, give to the words *life* and *immortality* a meaning not found in the Bible, and make assertions in direct conflict with its teaching. Thus have arisen much confusion and error."

Professor Harper of Yale.

In Dr. Walker's absence the FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND MONTHLY is certainly not falling off in interest. But one of its most readable features is the Editor's letter from America. Its frankness is quite refreshing. Dr. Walker speaks with much enthusiasm both of Princeton and of Yale. Of the Professor of Hebrew at Yale he says :—

"Professor Harper is at present the best known man in Yale. He is a young man of thirty-four, and his chair is that of the Semitic languages. I heard him teach a class in Hebrew, and I was not surprised at the enthusiasm which he has awakened. He is under call to take the presidency of a great College which the Baptists are establishing in Chicago, but the hope is that he will remain where he is. Dr. Green of Princeton and he are engaged at present in a friendly controversy over the Pentateuch, the controversy being carried on in the pages of a periodical which Harper edits, called *The Old Testament Student*. [This is a slip for *Hebraica*. Professor Harper edits both *Hebraica* and *The Old and New Testament Student*.] No one, he told me himself, has been his teacher. He took to the Eastern tongues instinctively."

Alexander Vinet.

There are signs that the name of Alexander Vinet will yet be lifted up in this country to that place of honour which is its due. A short sympathetic paper by Principal King is printed in the BRITISH WEEKLY PULPIT for 11th December, and the most readable of all the articles in this month's CONTEMPORARY (unless perhaps Professor Sayce's "Oriental Archæology") is by M. Gabriel Monod, under the title given above. It is impossible here and now to touch upon the points of it. But it is with peculiar pleasure we notice that, among the list of authorities for the life and writings of Vinet, M. Monod places Miss Lane's book first (T. & T. Clark, 1890, 7s. 6d.); for our own notice, though appreciative, was all too brief to do justice to its merits. "Miss Lane's book," he says, "will certainly do much to popularise Vinet in England. To appreciate Vinet you must know his life, you must be made acquainted with his character—the character of one of the noblest souls that ever lived; and Miss Lane is an excellent guide. She has read everything that Vinet has written, and everything that has been written about him. She has thoroughly understood him and, what is better, she has thoroughly loved him, which indeed is the best way of understanding."

The Church Bells Portrait Gallery.

The December issue contains portraits and sketches of the life of the Bishop of Manchester, the Dean of Windsor, the Dean of Westminster, and W. Paget Bowman, M.A.

"Work Down."

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD, the greatest of all the missionary magazines, is particularly strong in "Editorial Paragraphs." Here is one :—

"Mr. Meigs finely said, at the late National Missionary Convention in Indianapolis, that the object of that gathering was to '*work down* the missionary spirit.' He explained that usually missionary interest first struck the *head*, and after a while got as far as the *mouth*, then the *heart*, *conscience*, and *will*, by and by the *pocket*, and last of all the *legs* and *feet*. Blessed are they on whom the missionary spirit works down far enough to produce those winged sandals—the alacrity of a messenger of the Gospel!"

Et Multi?

To speak of Editorial paragraphs that are breezy and invigorating, and pass by the KNOX COLLEGE MONTHLY of Toronto, would be unpardonable. But when we remember what former paragraphs have done to former carpers, we hesitate to quote the following and put in an interrogation anywhere :—

"Another book that fairly bristles with points is a new polemical work by the redoubtable Dr. Watts of Belfast. This time it is the *New Apologetic* that comes under the professor's slashing pen. The secondary title, *The Down Grade in Criticism, Theology, and Science*, augurs ill for Dods, Bruce, Drummond, *et multi*. If anything of "Apologetic" remains, "New" or "Old," we shall report next month."

Browning's Argument for the Incarnation.

THE UNITED METHODIST FREE CHURCHES MAGAZINE, in a new wrapper for Christmas, opens with an excellent short paper on Browning. Reference is made to Browning's argument, chiefly in "Saul," for the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, thus: Whether we accept a real Christ or not, we are bound to admit that He exists as an idea in history, in the Church, and in the minds of men. In "A Death in the Desert" Browning asks the unbelievers what gave *origin* to the *idea;* and the reply is, "Ourselves can love and would be loved; therefore, *we ourselves create* the love." In other words, our want of a real Christ has led us to image an unreal Christ. Now Browning's argument is this—If the want of a Christ led to the creation of an idealised Christ, then such want is the strongest argument for the existence of a real Christ. Hence in "Saul" we have these lines—

"'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for! my flesh that I seek
In the Godhead! I seek and I find it. O! Saul, it shall be
A face like my face that receives thee: a man like to me
Thou shalt love and be loved by for ever: a hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the CHRIST stand!"

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'A MINUTE study of the mere words of Scripture," said Dr. Maclaren recently, "though it may seem like grammatical trifling and pedantry, yields large results. Men do sometimes gather grapes of thorns; and the hard, dry work of trying to get at the precise shade of meaning in Scripture words always repays with large lessons and impulses." A more emphatic testimony to the truth of that statement could scarcely be found than the volume of *Ordination Addresses and Counsels to Clergy*, by the late Bishop Lightfoot, issued a few weeks ago by Macmillan. That it is a volume of deep interest goes without saying. But it is worth saying that, of the greater portion of it, the deepest interest arises from the study of mere words, and that just because of the large lessons and impulses which they are made to yield.

Take as an example Phil. ii. 3, "Do nothing of party spirit, nor yet of vain glory" (*μηδὲν κατὰ ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν*). After pointing out that two distinct habits of mind are here condemned and rejected, a distinction more or less obliterated by the common text (*ἢ κενοδοξίαν*), Dr. Lightfoot asks what these two tempers are. Briefly, he replies, "they are the spirit which unduly exalts party, and the spirit which unduly exalts self." "The one is *eritheia* (*ἐριθεία*). I need not remind you that this word is confused with *eris* (*ἔρις*), and translated 'strife' in the Authorised Version. But its true significance is thus obliterated, and the force of the passage before us disappears. It denotes the temper, habit, principle of action of the *erithos* (*ἔριθος*)—the hireling, the hired servant, the hired canvasser, the hired partisan. Thus it designates party-spirit generally; for, though no actual money may have passed into his hands, the partisan, consciously or unconsciously, is influenced by the motive of gain. It may be influence, or success, or reputation, or the getting one's own way, or the humiliation of one's enemies, or some other low aim. But in some form or other gain to self, through the triumph of party, is the underlying motive. Though the direct object is not self, yet ultimately this spirit may be traced to self. But in the other word, *kenodoxia* (*κενοδοξία*), self is the immediate as well as the ultimate aim. The whole motive concentrates itself on self. It is the inflated estimate of one's own ability, one's own reputation, one's own position and importance."

Equally interesting is Dr. Lightfoot's treatment of the paradox of Gal. vi. 2, 5: "Bear ye one another's burdens;" "Every man shall bear his own burden." Dr. Lightfoot admits the paradox, holding that such self-contradiction is sometimes necessary to the expression of the highest truth. "It is worth observing, however," he goes on, "that though the same word, 'burden,' appears in both places in the English Version, this is not the case in the original (*ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε· ἕκαστος τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει*). The difference seems to be a matter of deliberate choice. There are burdens of various kinds — physical, moral, social, spiritual — which befall a man; trials which come and go, troubles which may be shared or removed, a miscellaneous aggregate of anxieties and vexations and oppressions. These are his *barē* (*βάρη*). But over and

above all these—though not perhaps independent of these—there is one particular load, which he cannot shake off, which he must make up his mind to bear, which he is destined to carry on his own shoulders (it may be) through life to the end. This is τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον, his *pack* (as it were), a well-defined particular load, which is his and not another's, which never can be another's."

This "pack"—Dr. Lightfoot thinks the Apostle is using another of those military metaphors in which he delights — may be some physical disability, some intellectual hindrance to our ministerial efficiency, something in our social or domestic surroundings, or it may be some neglect or recklessness or sin in the past, which has hung a weight about our necks. "The sin may be repented of; the pardon may be assured. But the temporal consequences of the sin remain, and will remain, so long as we have breath. This is the most irksome and the most painful form which a man's individual burden can take."

If Dr. Lightfoot's interpretation of "Every man shall bear his own burden" is the correct one, may there not be a hidden reference in the words to St. Paul's own "thorn in the flesh." Dr. George Matheson, in his new work on the *Spiritual Development of St. Paul* (Blackwood, 5s.), holds decidedly by the belief that the apostle's thorn was physical and not moral, and concludes, from various data, that it was an affection of the eyes. The argument which seems to Dr. Matheson to prove conclusively that the thorn was not a moral stain is this: Had it been moral—a heated temper, a jealous disposition, or a lustful passion—we cannot conceive that, when the Apostle prayed for its removal, he would have received or imagined that he had received, a denial to that prayer. Besides, in the case of a moral defect the grace of God is never sufficient for us, does not profess nor desire to be sufficient for us. The climax of the moral life is not grace, but glory.

Archdeacon Farrar has often been blamed for making so much of St. Paul's thorn. It may be said that Dr. Matheson makes more of it. As we have stated, his conclusion is that it was defective vision, not total but partial blindness. One could well pardon Dr. Matheson if he dwelt long upon this. But, however much the interest of the narrative is deepened by our knowledge of the personal reference, it is no personal motive that gives the "thorn" so large a place in Dr. Matheson's book. It is because he finds in this "thorn in the flesh" the key to the interpretation of St. Paul's spiritual history. To trace the working out of this interpretation would be to transcribe the greater part of Dr. Matheson's able and eloquent volume. To give it in bald outline is to do the book a grievous injustice. Let it suffice to mention that he believes the thorn to have been given at the time of the conversion. Now, to a Jew, a physical defect was a mark of Divine displeasure. Paul's first thought, therefore, was that God had branded him, and he was unfit for being a missionary. Like another Jonah he fled from his mission, fled to the deserts of Arabia. There he prayed the first of those three prayers—"I besought the Lord thrice"—that it might be taken away. The prayer was denied; and Paul learned that, *notwithstanding* his defect, he was called upon to preach the gospel. This was his first spiritual crisis. Two more had yet to come; for, as with his Master in Gethsemane, the struggle and the prayer were thrice repeated. The first conflict took place under the shadows of Sinai; the second is most closely associated with Antioch; and the third experienced its fiercest hour in connection with the Church of Galatia. Thus the "thorn" is made to determine the course of the Apostle's spiritual development, and to mark its successive stages, till at last it comes to be counted a *privilege*, an infirmity in which he was enabled to glory.

Dr. Matheson's *Spiritual Development of St. Paul* is an able book—large-hearted, spiritually-minded—yet it is not his greatest book. Not long since we read, for the second time, his *Growth of the Spirit of Christianity* in its two handsome volumes. That is his *magnum opus* still, and contains more than the germ of his subsequent writings. Again and again we have been reminded of its pages as we read this latest volume; which was natural, for this would serve very well as an introduction to the earlier book. But not only is the new book not the greatest, but it seems to be more open to challenge. And challenged it certainly will be. Many who would find profit in its pages will be

unable even to enter in because of the barrier, or rather want of barrier, in the shape of any theory of inspiration at the opening. Some will question the inferences that are made from familiar passages, and not a few will deny the interpretation of the passages themselves.

We may refer to an instance of the last which will be sure to be called in question. In the December number of the *Contemporary Review* an article may be found by Miss Frances Power Cobbe, under the title of "The Two Religions." Its purpose is not clear, but its meaning is plain. The religions of mankind, says Miss Cobbe, are usually of two orders only—namely, the worship of POWER, and the worship of GOODNESS. Then she says that "among the Hebrews, in the time of Joshua and the Judges and of David, the history would indicate that the worship of Jehovah was still little better than a barren Power-worship, the character attributed to Him being grossly cruel; witness"—and then we have the story of Agag, the harrows of iron, and the brick-kilns. Dr. Matheson, though without these references, and probably without these thoughts, holds on the main point with Miss Cobbe. He says: "The Jew's first admiration of kinghood was derived from the contemplation of the universe. He looked upon the face of nature and beheld there the impress of power. The objects which excited his wonder, the objects which stimulated his inspiration, were the physical forces which manifest themselves in dynamical strength. His very first conception of Divine action in the universe was the conception of *a rushing mighty wind moving on the face of the waters*, and bearing down all opposition to its will. From this time forth the attribute which, above all others, he beheld in Deity was power." The words which we have italicised refer to Gen. i. 2, which we are accustomed to read in the translation: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters"; but which Dr. Matheson seems to translate: "A (rushing) mighty wind moved on the face of the waters." This translation, we say, will be challenged. For, although a possible rendering of the Hebrew—as any one can see by reading Mr. Wratislaw's paper in this issue—it receives but scant support from the modern commentator. Says Delitzsch (New Commentary on Genesis, Vol. I.), "Certainly *ruach* means 'breeze' and 'spirit,' the verb (רחף) however, cannot be used of the wind, but indicates that the action of the Spirit is similar to that of a bird, as Milton says:—

'Dove-like sat'st *brooding* on the vast abyss.'

For רִחֵף means, according to its root, to keep the wings loose, so that they touch and yet do not touch, and then both to brood with loose wings over and to hover down in flight upon anything." So Dods (*Book of Genesis:* Bible Class Handbooks), "The expression *hovered over* could not be used of 'a great wind.'" But such a criticism of Dr. Matheson will be beside the mark. For the question is not, what does the modern commentator say? nor, what does Dr. Matheson say? but, what did the Jews believe to be the translation of these words? And, although the rendering of the LXX. is ambiguous, like the Hebrew, there can be no doubt that the current Jewish interpretation was of "a mighty wind" and not of the Spirit of God, as the paper already referred to abundantly shows.

That Dr. Matheson himself does not translate the words "a mighty wind," we happen to know; or, if otherwise, he has changed his mind on the point within the last two years, and is now prepared to cancel the first page of his most suggestive little book of devotion, *Voices of the Spirit* (Nisbet, 1888, 3s. 6d.). There, using the Authorised Version as translation, "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," he begins: "Before God said, 'Let there be light,' He said, 'Let there be Spirit.' It was the keynote of all His voices to the human soul." And then: "O Thou Divine Spirit, whose breath preceded all things, I am seeking to invert the order of Thy work. I am asking for other things before Thee. I am crying for light, for sun and moon and star, for the green herb, for the bird of heaven. I am forgetting that without Thee the light would not charm, the grass would not grow, the bird would not sing. Come Thyself first of all, and move upon the face of the waters."

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December the subject of the Intermediate State was touched upon. Since then an important contribution has

been made to that subject by Canon Luckock, who has published a volume under the title of *The Intermediate State between Death and Judgment* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1890, 6s.). On the direct point of our note—the meaning of the words "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades," Ps. xvi. 10, and Acts ii. 27—Dr. Luckock takes the other side. He admits, however, that the words are "capable of a meaning which would limit the reference simply to the death and burial which preceded the Resurrection of our Lord, for hell, or *Sheol*, is often used in the Old Testament for the grave, and the soul of man not infrequently indicates his person merely; "indeed, it has been even at times regarded as a synonym for his body." In proof of which he quotes the three passages, Lev. v. 2, vii. 25, Ps. xlix. 15; and then adds in a footnote: "Beza so translated it here (Acts. ii. 27), Non derelinques *cadaver* meum in sepulchro, but changed it in a later edition because he said (Ed. Test. 1582) some persons were offended by the rendering." Dr. Luckock's objection to this interpretation is twofold. "To accept this interpretation," he says, "would be a distinct narrowing of the real significance of which the expression is capable; moreover, it would render the introduction of the clause, 'He descended into hell,' into the Creed otiose and needless, for it already contained the declaration that He 'was dead and buried.'" To which those whose standpoint is different from Canon Luckock's would reply that the *real* significance, judging from Scripture language, is just this which he calls "narrow" and no more; and that the Creed must take care of itself.

Canon Luckock's volume, notwithstanding its ability and fairness, will have no influence with those who have studied the subject and still hold with the Westminster divines that "besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none." For how can they be agreed in belief who differ so widely upon the authority for their belief? To Canon Luckock the Westminster assertion shows "a startling recklessness of fact." But suppose the sole authority for his belief were the Scriptures themselves, and that "the primitive Fathers" were in evidence only as fallible interpreters of that Word, then the startling recklessness would in all probability disappear.

Is it too much to say that the acceptance or rejection of the doctrine or dogma of Purgatory depends upon the interpretation given to the single statement in 1st Peter (iii. 19), that Christ "went and preached to the spirits in prison"? In the case of those who have studied the subject no doubt it is. But for the general reader it probably is not. And yet it is notorious that it is one of the most difficult passages, if not *the* most difficult and variously interpreted passage in the New Testament. The Methodist papers have recently had the subject of the Intermediate State much *en evidence*, and of course this passage has had its share of attention, as one may see by consulting *The Christian Advocate* (Nos. 38–45, 1890), or the *Primitive Methodist World* (Nos. 396–407). *The Expository Times* had a short note on the text from an exact scholar (Vol. I. p. 148); and Dr. Witherspoon, of Louisville, contributes a paper upon it to the November issue of the *Homiletic Review*.

After laying down with clearness and convincing force the conditions which a sound exegesis of the passage must obey, Dr. Witherspoon says that those who concede these principles "must be brought to the conclusion of Principal Cunningham, the eminent theologian and ecclesiastic of Scotland, who, in his admirable work, *Historical Theology* (T. & T. Clark, 2 vols. 21s.) summarily disposes of the subject in the following brief but emphatic paragraph:—

'With respect to the very obscure and difficult passage in 1 Peter iii. 19, about Christ's going and preaching to the spirits in prison, I must say that I have never yet met with an interpretation of it that seemed to me altogether satisfactory. Among the many interpretations of it that have been given, there are just two in support of which anything really plausible, as it appears to me, can be advanced, viz., that which regards the preaching thus spoken of as having taken place in the time of Noah, and through the instrumentality of Noah; and, secondly, that which regards it as having taken place after His resurrection, and through the instrumentality of the Apostles; the

latter view is ably advocated in Dr. John Brown's *Expository Discourses on First Peter*. If either of these interpretations be the true one, the passage has no reference to the period of His history between His death and His resurrection.'"

Notwithstanding all this, Dr. Witherspoon proposes a new theory. Let us present the points of it; for though not altogether new, as he says, it has new points in it, and a cogency in the way they are put. Christ, says S. Peter, was "put to death *in the flesh* (σαρκί the dative of the part affected); indeed it was that He might become subject to death that "the Word was made flesh" (ἐγένετο σάρξ). This "flesh," then, is His mortal body. But He "was quickened in the spirit" (πνεύματι, same dative). What is this "spirit"? In 1 Cor. xv. S. Paul calls the present body "a natural body" (σῶμα ψυχικόν) to distinguish it from the "spiritual body" (σῶμα πνευματικόν). Here S. Peter calls the former simply flesh (σάρξ); what hinders then that he should call the latter, the spiritual body, simply spirit (πνεῦμα). "In which (resurrection body) He went and preached to the spirits in prison." Now, the verb "preached" here (κηρύσσω) is simply "published" or "proclaimed;" and this proclamation was not the gospel, but the fact that He had obtained the victory over death and had completed His work. This proclamation was so far-sounding, says S. Peter, that it reached even (καὶ) to the men of Noah's day, now spirits in prison on account of their sin and unbelief,—even to them came tidings of the fulfilment of all Noah's predictions in the victory of Christ over death and the grave.

Professor Huxley and the Destruction of the Gerasene Swine.

I.

By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.

I have read your able paper with great interest. I do not like, however, the conclusion at which Bengel arrives. And I am not at all afraid to take up Huxley's challenge, and show that, if we accept the Gadarene district as the scene, there is still, according to Josephus, no ground for his verdict.

II.

By the Rev. Principal J. B. M'Clellan, M.A.

The only true, and the complete and irrefragable answer to Professor Huxley's attack on our Lord's miracle of the Expulsion of the Unclean Spirits, and the concomitant destruction of the Gerasene Swine as "illegal and immoral," appears to me to lie in a nutshell, and, unless I am mistaken, it is already suggested by the editor of The Expository Times in the January issue in the phrase "origin of evil."

The answer, however, is this, and Professor Huxley cannot be allowed to escape from it. He sets up and attacks for "illegal and immoral" conduct a man of whom the world has never heard. The wielding of all his weapons, therefore, is simply a beating of the air. Whether Professor Huxley believes in the Gospels or not, is immaterial to this issue: he takes them as the source of the narrative he impugns. He is bound, therefore, to take the agent whose conduct he arraigns as the agent *presented by them*, not an agent *whom they do not present*, or he is at once convicted of the fallacy of the *ignoratio elenchi*. Now the agent whom they present (rightly or wrongly it matters not, I say, to the issue) is the *Christ of the Gospels*, the Christ whom these spirits in this very narrative recognise as "*Son of God;*" the Christ who does "*the works which the Father hath given Him to do*" (John v. 36), and of which works it is said, "*The Father who sent me, He doeth the works*" (John xiv. 10). The act of *this* agent, therefore, the agent *represented by the Gospels*, is an act of *divine agency*, and consequently its "legality and morality" in the "destruction of private property" (whether the Gerasenes were Jews or not, this again is immaterial) is exactly the same as the "legality and morality" of destruction of private property, or of life itself, by flood or fire, pestilence or famine, or any other "sore judgment" of the Almighty Lord of all things and of all men. I must leave it to Professor Huxley to say whether he will arraign the Almighty Owner or not. If he presume to do this, he cannot and will not stop at the Gerasene miracle. Believers in Professor Huxley's Theology and Philosophy may admit that he has convicted and overthrown his own phantom, but he has utterly failed to weaken or even touch the Gospel record of the Christ.

*

A Critical Examination of Genesis i. to xi.

By the Rev. F. H. Woods, B.D., St. John's College, Oxford.

One of the most marked features of biblical study is the attention which is being increasingly paid to what is called "the higher criticism." In religious circles this is too often looked upon with suspicion and even dislike. It is regarded as connected with free thought or infidelity. But in itself it is no such thing. It is nothing more than the free investigation of certain facts. To refuse to look facts in the face is to put the very worst weapon into the hand of the adversary. It is a confession of weakness and fear. It is sometimes said that criticism does not deal with facts, but only with arbitrary theories. The real truth is, of course, that criticism has elucidated a certain number of facts, and from these drawn its conclusions. If these conclusions are wrong, well and good; but let us be quite sure that we have first looked into the facts for ourselves. Again, it is urged that critics contradict each other so much, that there is no reasonable assurance that one is right any more than another. But cannot the same be said in a measure of every branch of investigation? We should not, if we had even an elementary knowledge of architecture, dispute the fact of some old Cathedral being composed of different styles of architecture, nor question in the main which parts belonged to which style, because archæologists quarrelled about the exact relative dates of certain unimportant features. So it is with the higher criticism. There is coming to be a remarkable consensus of opinion among the majority of those who have most carefully studied the subject. It is about comparatively minor points that they disagree. In this, as in all other sciences, there is a tendency to form conjectures beyond what the facts confessedly prove. This is a reason for caution in accepting wholesale the views of any one critic, not a reason for rejecting the critical method. But we do not ask any one to accept even the conclusions on which critics are generally agreed; but to study the facts for themselves. Once more, let us not confound facts and conclusions.

There is no part of the Old Testament in which the facts on which the critical theories are based are more conspicuous than the Book of Genesis, and therefore more easily and profitably studied. But why not be content with old beliefs? Why not be satisfied with the unbroken tradition of ancient times that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch? The critic answers that to his eyes it is self-evident that this was not so; that the narrative bears the most obvious marks of being a compilation from different sources, not an original narrative by one person. Let us examine these early chapters of Genesis and see whether we cannot look with the critic's eyes. If these chapters are a compilation from comparatively few sources, we are pretty sure to find traces of certain phrases, thoughts, or ways of speaking marking each source, and distinguishing it from the others. If a modern historian were to write a History of England based upon those of Hume and Macaulay, we should be sure to find traces of both throughout his work; and it might be quite possible for a literary scholar, supposing that at some future time both Hume's and Macaulay's histories were lost, to separate to a certain extent the parts derived from Hume and the parts derived from Macaulay.

But this is very far from being really analogous to the case before us. In the works of ancient compilers it was not customary, as in modern works, to aim at reconstructing their sources in the style of the composer, but they were dovetailed together with little alteration beyond the addition of explanatory notes. We have the most familiar example of this in the Synoptic Gospels. The notes or pieces which St. Matthew adds from his own pen, such as iv. 14–16, xxvii. 62–66, can be clearly distinguished in character from the fundamental gospel which is the basis of all three synoptists, and again from those parts which he has in common with St. Luke. We, therefore, should expect to find in Genesis, if a compilation, not only a greater difference of style between sections borrowed from different sources, but also sudden marks of transition, when the compiler passes from a piece taken from one source to a piece taken from another, and these things are precisely what we do find.

Let us see, then, how far we are able with any certainty to resolve these early chapters into their component parts. The abrupt transitions of language and style will help us very much at every point in making our division and classification, so that we generally get throughout paragraphs or sections which are clearly distinguishable. Now, what strikes us at once most forcibly is that the same Divine title is in most cases employed throughout the same section, but in sections following each other different titles are frequently used. This is often regarded as the key-stone of the whole critical theory, and must be treated in some detail. The Divine names employed are (1) God (Elohim), (2) The Lord (Jehovah or, more strictly, Yahweh), (3) The Lord God (Yahweh Elohim). Throughout Gen. i.–ii.

3, we find Elohim in almost every verse. In ii. 4–iii. 24 the title employed, and that again with great frequency, is Yahweh Elohim. In chap. iv. it is Yahweh throughout, except once in ver. 25; and this title occurs very frequently in the first sixteen verses. In chap. v. Elohim occurs four times, Yahweh once in ver. 29. In the history of the Flood, vi.–ix., the distinction of passages thus characterised is more difficult to trace; but in some paragraphs it is clear enough. Thus in vi. 1–8, Yahweh is the proper designation of God; Elohim occurs only in the phrase "sons of Elohim," and may very possibly mean angels. In the next section, vers. 9–22, Elohim is used throughout. In vii. 1–5, Yahweh is again used. In what follows to viii. 19 the Divine name does not frequently occur, and in vii. 16 both appear in juxtaposition. It is on this and other grounds believed that here we have a more complete fusion of the original sources. In viii. 20–22, we have the word Yahweh twice. In ix. 1–17, the word Elohim (only) occurs several times. In the rest of the chapter the Divine name does not occur except in the poetical prophecy describing the blessing of Shem and the curse of Canaan, when both names are employed, vers. 26, 27. In chap. x. the Divine name occurs only once (ver. 9), and then it is Yahweh. In xi. 1–9 this word is used frequently, but never Elohim. In the genealogy of Shem, vers. 10–25, no Divine name is found.

Now, it is maintained by critics that these different Divine names occur sufficiently frequently and with sufficient regularity to justify the assumption that the sections characterised by one Divine title are from a different source or set of sources from those in which another occurs.[1] If this general rule is proved by the frequency of cases where it applies, we are then clearly justified in conjecturing explanations which may account for exceptions; and it is hardly just to say that critics are merely tampering with the text to suit *à priori* theories in trying so to explain them. Their argument is clearly, in the first instance, *à posteriori*. Now, to begin with, it is extremely probable that a compiler, who generally inserted the sections as he found them, might occasionally insert a note in which he would naturally use either name without any distinction. This would account for Elohim in chap. iv. 25 and for Yahweh in chap. v. 29, both of which bear the character of philological notes, and may well have been added to give the traditional meanings attached to the words Seth and Noah in the compiler's time, or they may have been added by a still later redactor. It is also open to question, whether chap. ii. 4 (or $4b^2$)–iii. 24 should not be classed with the portions in which Yahweh is used. It certainly resembles chap. iv. in its general character, and it is at least plausible to suppose that Elohim may have been added by the compiler to identify the Yahweh of the second section with the Elohim of the first. It was not, of course, necessary to carry this out any further. It would have been clumsy to have dropped it before.

There are two things further to be noticed about these two kinds of sources (supposing that we are right in connecting chap. ii. $4b$–iii. 24 and iv.). 1. That each kind of source is often distinguished by other characteristics besides the use of the Divine names. A good deal of stress is laid by critics on the difference of vocabulary employed by each, but as this would require a lengthy discussion of Hebrew words, and an argument drawn from such a limited number of passages would be very hazardous, it will be sufficient to mention it, and leave the reader to work it out for himself as far as he can. Of more importance is their difference in general character. Certainly the Yahwistic sections contain more of what we might call stories. The Garden of Eden, the history of Cain and Abel, probably the incident of Lamech, and the Tower of Babel belong only to this group. The only story which the Elohistic sources contain, and that in common with the Yahwistic, is the history of the Flood. Again, the Yahwistic narrative is characterised by picturesqueness and detailed description, and is fuller of the marvellous and the supernatural. The serpent is gifted with speech; the sons of God form an unholy alliance with the daughters of men, and produce a race of giants; the rebellious "children of men" build a tower whose top was to be in heaven. Again, it is more anthropomorphic. Yahweh walks in the garden in the cool of the day; He makes for Adam and his wife coats of skin, and clothes them; He comes down to see the city and the tower which the children of men builded; He smells the sweet savour. The Elohistic portions are more prosaic in thought, though they sometimes partake of the artificial characters of later Hebrew poetry. We see this at once by comparing chap. i.–ii. 3 with ii. 4, etc. They contain most, if not all, of the genealogies. Two points here require notice. The phrase, "These are the generations of" (in chap. v. 1, "This is the book of the generations of") is certainly characteristic of them, but it apparently occurs twice in this part of Genesis before Yahwistic sections, in chap. ii. 4 and x. 1. In the last case, however, the Divine name occurs only once in the section, in ver. 9. Is it not very possible that this is a note inserted by the compiler or a later hand? Chap. ii. $4a$ is an acknowledged difficulty. On any hypothesis it is not easy to see why an expression which is generally and naturally used of a genealogy of

[1] This criterion, as has been shown, enables us to divide definitely all except chaps. vii. 6–viii. 19 and xi. 10–25, and we should probably add chap. x. 1–14 for reasons given below.

[2] See below.

persons should be used of the heavens and the earth. It is very commonly assigned by critics to the preceding account of the creation. But this, not to mention the awkwardness of $4b$ as it would thus stand at the beginning of the section, is contrary to the usage of the phrase elsewhere in Genesis, according to which it always precedes the subject to which it refers. Other critics believe it to have been transposed from the beginning of chap. i.; but there seems no good reason why the compiler should have treated it in this way. A better conjecture, perhaps, is that he inserted it where it stands on the analogy of the other passages where it occurs. 2. A second fact worth noticing is that in many cases the Elohistic and Yahwistic narratives cover pretty nearly the same ground. We have, in part at any rate, two accounts of the creation. Probably the compiler was compelled, in order to get a natural sequence, to omit the first part of the Yahwistic creation narrative. We have a double mention of the line Adam-Seth-Enosh. A double account of the Flood. Chap. vi. 1–8 clearly corresponds to vi. 9–13. Again, viii. 20–22 bears resemblance to ix. 1–7. We have distinct indications of a double and closely parallel narative in the rest of the description; but the division into its several parts is extremely difficult and uncertain. This probably accounts for the fact that whereas Noah in vii. 2 is commanded to take of each clean animal seven, and two of every other, he is distinctly said, in vers. 8, 9, to have taken two of all animals, whether clean or unclean (cf. also ver. 15).

Having thus come to the conclusion that the Yahwistic and Elohistic sources are distinct, we naturally ask whether we have any grounds for determining which are the most ancient. Everything seems to point to the priority of the Yahwistic. The name of Yahweh, the peculiar name of the national Hebrew God, as distinct from the different gods of the other nations, is an early conception; whereas Elohim used absolutely implies that there is only one true God. The anthropomorphic idea of God is, of course, a sign of antiquity. The Yahwistic stories of the first chapters of Genesis remind us, in some of their features, of the early stories of primitive traditions existing among all nations. We see how the earliest threads of revelation corresponded, under Divine guidance, with the crude notions of a primitive people. This is one of the most important results of biblical criticism. It shows how God revealed Himself, not only "in divers manners," but in "divers portions," gradually making Himself and His laws known, as men were able to understand them, until by degrees He made possible that perfect knowledge which came to man in the Incarnate Person of Jesus Christ. Those who maintain the unity of the Book of Genesis have to explain how it is that the writer begins with a highly theological conception of God and creation, though not altogether scientific from our modern point of view, and then goes back to a circle of religious ideas suited to the human race in its early childhood.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xiii. 11.

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child: now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things" (R.V.).

Exposition.

"*I spake*" is an unfortunate rendering, precisely what St. Paul did *not* mean. Render "as an infant I talked." Λέγειν, *to speak rationally and articulately;* λαλεῖν (used here), *to talk, prate, chatter.—Evans.*

It is difficult not to admit that "spoke" is a covert allusion to the "tongues," and if so, it is an additional proof that this gift consisted in ecstatic utterance.—*Edwards.*

"*I felt.*" The word expresses the unity of feeling, thought, and will: "I felt, I aspired." Thus prophecy, whose glance penetrates to the perfection yet to come, corresponds to the ardent aspirations of the childish heart, which goes out eagerly into the future, expecting from it joy and happiness.—*Godet.*

This word (φρονεῖν) is not the generic name for emotion, though it includes emotion as well as thought. It seems to be used in the general meaning of thinking. The first stage is that in which the child babbles, and is slowly learning articulate speech. It enters on the second stage when it learns to think—that is, to form general notions. Tyndall's rendering is, "I ymagened." The third stage in the child's mental history is reasoning; from its general notions it draws inferences.—*Edwards.*

"I spoke . . . I thought . . . I reasoned."—*Ellicott.*

It seems evident to me that by the three terms the Apostle alludes to the three gifts—tongues, prophecy, knowledge.—*Godet.*

The gift of tongues shall be as the feeble articulations of an infant; the gift of prophecy shall be as an infant's half-formed thoughts; the

gift of knowledge shall be as the infant's half-formed reasonings.—*Stanley.*

"*Now that I am become.*" Not "when I became." And "I have put away," not "I put away." The Greek perfects assert the permanence of the change from childhood to manhood, and the permanent dismissal of childish things.—*Beet.*

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Gnosticism and Agnosticism.

By the Rev. Professor G. Salmon, D.D.

The difference between childhood and manhood may be seen (1) in the attitude of the mind towards intellectual problems. The easy become difficult, the difficult easy. John's Gospel is a delightfully easy book for the schoolboy, but there is no book that presents harder problems to the mature commentator. (2) In moral questions. The childish mind thanks God that he was born of "Christian race, and not a heathen or a Jew." The cultured mind finds perplexities in the providence that bestows such diversity of condition and capacity. (3) In the history of religious thought and speculation. The Gnostics, who had the courage to resolve every problem that could be raised, represent the period of childhood. The Agnosticism of the present day claims that it exhibits the man's modesty of reticence in the face of insoluble problems. But modesty is the last virtue that can be attributed to Agnosticism. For before you can say that a way has no outlet, you must have explored it to the very end. The true manhood belongs to the Christian, who, while refraining from criticising God's ways, rests upon His justice and His love with unfaltering faith.

II.

Childishness. (*To Boys.*)

By the Ven. J. M. Wilson, M.A.

I wish to speak of moral powers only, of the way in which you have to meet your own moral childishness and weaknesses. You know the story of Hercules and the Hydra, how, when he cut off one head of the snake, two more grew at once in its place, until he found a plan for burning them off; and so it is with childishness, cut off one form or manifestation, two more will grow up, unless you go to the root of the matter, and burn and cauterise it off.

1. There is the childishness of carelessness, which actually leads to dishonesty. It may take the most elementary form of thoughtless dishonesty of work, or even of taking no pains to be scrupulous in matters of propriety.

2. There is the childishness of cowardice. In young boys this may be natural enough. But sometimes it takes the form of a base shrinking from responsibility on the part of a responsible person—

> "He is a slave who dare not be,
> In the right with two or three."

3. There is childishness in the purposelessness of so many lives. In a child one does not expect purpose or persistent endeavour. Ask yourselves what you are living for. Take your purpose before God in your prayers.

4. There is childishness in hoping for results without taking due means. You hope to grow up intelligent, and do not give the labour of mind. You hope to grow up strong and self-reliant in character, and do not resist the small and frequent temptations to neglect duties. You hope to find God in your age, and do not look for Him in your youth.

5. There is the childishness of misplaced admiration. You mistake coarseness for independence, swagger for courage, foulness for knowledge of the world, idleness for cleverness, cynicism for thoughtfulness.

6. There is the childishness of the wavering standard of right and wrong, that takes its tone from the persons that happen to form your society—like the little fortresses on the frontier of France and Germany that were taken and retaken alternately as either side happened to predominate in their neighbourhood.

What is the cure for all this? What is the secret of true manliness? It is the sense of responsibility to God for your life. Bring your faults daily before God in prayer. And to prayer add self-searching, and earnest effort to bring yourself into His presence.

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

The capacity of growth is that which, more than anything else, distinguishes one mind from another.—*John Ker; Thoughts for Heart and Life.*

There are few men who do not at times send back a gentle glance into their early days. But between us and the Apostle there is an expressive difference here. We usually turn from the past with a sigh, and a sweet sense of irrevocable loss; he, with clasped hands in thanksgiving, as in the glory of an infinite gain. We, too often, in putting away childish things, part with the wrong elements, losing the heavenly insight, keeping the earthly darkness. We put away the guileless mind, the pure vision, the simple trust, the tender conscience; and reserve the petty scale of thought, the hasty will, the love of joys and strife. Paul put away only the ignorance and littleness of childhood, bearing with him its freshness, its truth, its God, into the grand work of his full age.—*James Martineau.*

I recollect very well sitting on the steps of the kitchen door (when father and mother were gone to meeting, and the girls had gone on a visit), and listening to the frogs and crying, I knew not why, until the wished-for people were at

home again; and I had some heart-sense of the loves and wants of the household. But what was that compared with the educated idea of the rich interblendings and gradations and variations of the domestic loves that have come upon the pallet of my heart since that time? And yet, does the wealth of this conception cast out and despise that early experience?—*H. W. Beecher.*

RELIGION delights both in reminiscence and in anticipation. Being full of the sense of God, it finds a unity in life which no atheistic thought can discover. The identity of God's eternal being stretches under, and gives consistence to, our fragmentary lives.—*Phillips Brooks.*

NEITHER the Apostle nor any one else has ever stepped directly from childhood into manhood; it was his purpose here only to notice the two extreme points of the change which had taken place in him, passing over its intermediate stages.—*T. Arnold.*

IN the case of Christ's disciples the passage from spiritual childhood to spiritual manhood took place in one day, with the giving of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. Compare their helplessness and ignorance before that day (Matt. xvii. 14, xviii. 1, xx. 20; John xiv. 8) with the firmness and zeal in their Master's service which they immediately began to exercise.—*J. H. Newman.*

Ephesians ii. 14.

"He is our peace who made BOTH ONE."

"OUR peace" by the abolition of the enmity, "one" by the removal of the dividing wall. The union, then, is of man and man, not of man and God. Nay, the enmity that parted was such as tended to unite the Jew with, rather than separate him from, his God. This oneness—being the revelation of the age-long mystery and the *rationale* of the Pauline mission described in chapter iii.—is the central thought of this preceding paragraph (vers. 11–22), and is not to be confounded with the larger thought with which it is in some measure blended, and which is expressed in vers. 16–18—the thought of the reconciliation of the united body to God.

2. Mankind had, over and above innumerable families and classes, ruthlessly divided the world of their horizon into two main portions, known to us by such nomenclature as Greek and barbarian, Jew and Gentile, circumcision and uncircumcision, twice born and once born, faithful and infidel, Christian and heathen. Once this separation was an infinite fact. The establishment of a new relationship and a new order marks the fulness of the seasons and unfolds the purpose of the ages.

3. The Christian is a new type. The twain are formed into one new man (ver. 15). Of this the ethical aspect, as a restoration of the original and perishing image, is given later (iv. 20). Here we notice the new type of man, outside nationality or race, free from all the limitations of the past. New with the materials drawn from both Jew and Gentile, with the flower (so to speak) of both Hebraism and Hellenism gathered into the higher unity in Christ.

4. The unity refers not only to the type, but to the whole situation and environment. Union of the ἀμφότερα (ver. 14) as well as the ἀμφοτέροι (ver. 16). They that were aliens are now fellow-citizens. As there is one body (v. 16) moved by one Spirit (ver 18), so also one faith, one baptism, one hope, and one knowledge.

5. Though the race separation is not explicitly carried back behind historic ordinances or laws, yet it was doubtless conceived as a consequence of sin, an effect ultimately of the fall. Thus Cain sought the land of wandering (Gen. iv. 14, 16). Mankind departed from God, and on diverse roads. Christ, in undoing sin and sin's work, recalls men erring and parted, regathers the scattered fragments of humanity, and reconstitutes a unity such as is sketched on the first pages of Scripture. The one word ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι (i. 10) seems to combine the three thoughts involved in re-union under one head.

6. And as the separation removed the Gentiles from the covenant and commonwealth that were formed, so the union effected by Christ and in Christ involved an equal community of both in the city and household of God (ver. 19), a fellowship (as the writer says further on, iii. 6) in the inheritance, in the membership of the body, and in the partaking of the promises of the New Dispensation.

7. The author of this union is Christ (1) by His death, for in His flesh He abolished the enmity, in His blood He made the distant nigh, through the cross He wrought the reconciliation, and secured that common access to the Father by which the union is maintained; and (2) by His resurrection and glory, which involved universal sovereignty, with the headship of the body, and the full endowment of the Church (i. 22).

8. Once more, the oneness is conceived of as a temple,—a holy home of God,—a vast building of many portions, yet of two great halves, which both extend from one head corner-stone. The building rests on its foundation; the body derives from the head. By either figure the stability, the completeness, the compactness, the necessary condition of growth and being, the oneness depends on Christ.

9. Finally, we must emphasise the words *peace* and *love*. Peace is the relationship of the two incorporating parts, and the bond of their spiritual unity. Love is the attitude of the individual towards the head and towards the fellow-members, securing a common flow of life, common mutual adjustment, mutual help, general growth and strength and edification (iii. 17, iv. 15, 16).

R. SCOTT.

The Humour of our Lord.

Part II.

By the Rev. Alexander B. Grosart, D.D., LL.D., Blackburn, Lancashire.

In our former Paper (The Expository Times for November), representative examples of what I dared to call the humour of our divinely-human and humanly-divine Lord, have been submitted. They were so submitted as guides to very many others, wherein—like the veining and luminousness of an agate—His humour interpenetrates His speech, even when that is of the most grave and solemn kind. In this faculty or quality—venturing the comparison with heart-felt reverence—our Lord's intellect and genius make Him kin with at once the loftiest and deepest and wisest human intellect and genius of all time. For in highest, deepest, wisest, tenderness and strength, pathos and brightness, melancholy and joy, wit and wisdom are startingly parallel if not indeed fused. So that one finds oneself inevitably returning upon the historic-biographic fact, that no master mind, in man or woman, has been without humour, less or more. *Ergo* it is to derogate from alike the absolute humanness and greatness of Jesus Christ, to assume that He is not to be thought of in relation to this element of humour. "Nay, verily," He was too profoundly human and too intellectually great not to have possessed this *signum* of greatest greatness all round.

I must be permitted still further to return on the same thought, and to affirm, that even amongst our Lord's saintliest servants of earlier and later times, the most saintly have been distinguished for humour—*e.g.* Jerome and Francis de Sales were perhaps as austere and spiritually-minded men as ever the Church of Christ has owned, and yet the Letters of the former scintillate with rarest sparkle of wit and humour—as to Vigilantius, who is slyly dubbed by him Dormitantius; and in the latter's delightful "Spiritual Letters," and others, you come on subtle and deftly-given strokes of the same, while the Bishop of Belley's "Spirit of S. Francis de Sales" furnishes abundant piquant things amid the fragrances of his holy life. One must suffice. Consulted once as to the propriety of going barefoot as was proposed in a certain religious house, Francis replied, "For goodness sake, let them keep their shoes. It is their heads you must try to reform, not their feet." Coming down later, few will gainsay that every way Fénélon had the finer brain and was the truer man, as placed beside Bossuet; and yet whilst the eagle of Meaux is grandly rhetorical, the Archbishop of Cambray is passionate as St. Paul and loving as St. John, and withal, renowned to-day for the ebullience of his wit and the blitheness and spontaneousness of his humour, *e.g.* in his *Dialogues des Morts*. Outside of these circles, not Luther only, but John Calvin and John Knox, and even tremendous Jonathan Edwards, had jets of sweet humour. Within our own Presbyterianism, in more recent times, it were not hard to recall foremost men whose humour was as inevitable as their devoutnesss, and as radiant as the weight ("wecht," Dr. Chalmers' word) of their utterances.

These additional preliminary and explanatory words will not have been written in vain if they further help to rid the reader of any sense of irreverence or incongruity in thinking of the humour of Christ.

In this second Paper, I propose to notice in detail a succession of illustrations of our Lord's humour throughout the Gospel of St. Matthew, and to add, summarily, other three from St. Luke.

It has been seen how vivid and iridescent with play of humour is Christ's taking-down of the dignitaries of Judaism by likening their reception of John the Baptist, and of Himself, to the capriciousness and fitfulness of sulky children who refused to join their companions in mimetic games of either mirth or mourning. I recur to this, because in the opening example of this Paper the ground-thought of the humour lies in our Lord's distinct purpose to "show up" (if the colloquialism be allowable) these Rabbis and Pharisees of Judaism, by holding up a flawless mirror, wherein they could not fail to see themselves as He saw them—and this followed with such word-portraits as remain unique in literature.

I start with the Sermon on the Mount, as recorded in St. Matthew; and let not the impatient reader deem it a foregone paradox to argue for humour in the Sermon on the Mount. It is no paradox. It is simple matter of fact. In the outset let the circumstances be observed. A miscellaneous "multitude"—including as usual rabbis and other dignitaries—has gathered around Him, and the Lord embraces the opportunity of promulgating the gracious moralities of His teaching in contrast with the formalism and superstition of later Judaism. By the ordering of events He has a typical "multitude" before Him, and He strikes home—perfectly aware of the surprise, nay indignation, that He will evoke.

Turning then to the Sermon on the Mount, we have the punctilious Formalist bitten in like an

etching, all the more memorable from the preceding beatitudes. We read: "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God" (ver. 8). And, "Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and trodden under the foot of man" (ver. 13). And "I say unto to you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (ver. 20). And again, "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (vers. 38, 39). Finally, "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that you may be sons of your Father which is in heaven; for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (vers. 43, 44).

Two elements inform these words, and indeed run through the entire Sermon on the Mount, and (in my judgment) suggest humour:—

1. The grotesque though also sad contrast between the actual and the ideal in the case of the vast majority of the "multitude" of followers to whom the Lord spoke. The very sweetness and sanctity of the phrase "pure in heart," turns it not merely into accusation but irony, and irony that was tremulous with humour. For what a beatitude was this to men whose whole religion was external and made up of interminable washings and ritual observances. Then how drastic a touch was that, "*If* the salt have lost its savour!"

2. The bewildering unexpectedness of the new Teacher's enunciations, the audacity of His innovations on traditional and contemporary opinion and sentiment. Even to-day one can picture the uplifted eyebrow, the snorting nostril, the hissing lip, as the hearers caught the charges: "Resist not him that is evil"; "Love your enemies." And all this aggravated by the supreme assumption of authority by Christ in His placing of "I say unto you" over against the divine law of Moses. But the Lord, as I maintain, foreknew all this, and could not have done so without a clear sense of humour.

Advancing, in chap. vi. of St. Matthew, we have kindred word-portraitures that reveal how seeing and searching were the eyes of our Lord in studying characters, and how incisive was His scrutiny of not the hypocritical merely, but the pompous and ridiculous. Let this be studied: "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them; else ye have no reward with your Father which is in heaven. When therefore thou doest alms, sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have received their reward" (vers. 1, 2). Self-evidently here the Lord drew from the life. He had seen and spotted and seen through this got-up spectacular doing of righteousness. What a stroke that, "Take heed that ye DO not your righteousness"! And then that sounding trumpet! A mere grave, solemn Rabbi would have left that out. But Christ put it in advisedly as He reproduces before their very eyes the heartless alms-giver and his hired runner-before. Is it conceivable that our Lord did not smile? albeit His smile passes into exquisite contempt for such hypocrites and their vain-glory, as He adds: "Verily I say unto you, They have received their reward." That is, not only such was the sum-total of their "reward," but it was already "received," and nothing to follow.

The same satirically-humorous and humorously-satirical touches follow,—*e.g.* "In praying, use not vain repetitions, as the Gentiles do; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking" (ver. 7). And, "When ye fast, be not as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance; for they disfigure their faces, that they may be seen of men to fast." . . . "But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face; that thou be not seen of men to fast, but of thy Father which is in secret."

Here again, got-up actors of a part, with their "disfigured" and dirty faces, stand out on the canvas imperishably. The cunningness of the portraiture, the turning inside out of the poor lay-figures revealing the spirting sawdust, the showing-up of the entire sham, compels us to recognise the Lord's humour side by side with His grief and holy indignation.

In chap. vii., the Lord again draws from the life and His own observation, so that we feel that it is in recollection of what He had Himself seen that He once more speaks (vers. 9, 10): "What man is there of you, who if his son shall ask him for a loaf, will give him a stone? or if he shall ask for a fish, will give him a serpent?" To this must be added the other illustration of an egg in St. Luke xi. 12, "Or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?" To grasp the humorous satiric significance of these successive intentional mistakes, it is to be remembered that the flat yellow-brown pieces of stone that lie scattered all over the sandy plains and desert spots of the East (especially in "the great and terrible wilderness") closely resemble Eastern loaves (so-called). Hence it might easily happen that not until the teeth snapped, and perchance smashed on the stone, would the discovery be made that it was stone and not bread. So with the fish. As with ourselves, there is an eel species of fish in Palestine—Sea of Galilee, Lake of Merom, and the Kishon—that could very

readily be represented by a lean yet longish "serpent." One must, therefore, think of the ludicrousness of the discovery, that instead of being an edible and savoury "fish," a nasty and even poisonous serpent was in the hand. And similarly with the "egg" passed off as a bird's egg. The Palestine "scorpion," as I repeatedly saw it, is housed in an egg very much resembling a pigeon's, though more globulus. So that again we have to picture the grotesque horror of the son on breaking the shell of his supposed choice morsel of an "egg" to find a flame-tongued "scorpion" darting out of it. To me, all this again tells how our Lord observed men and things, and took in the humours of them and turned them to account.

Our next saying has the grimness of a Rembrandt etching, but none the less a scintillation of humour in the verbal play on "dead": "Follow me; and leave the dead to bury their own dead."

The humour of Christ overflows sometimes, and one seems to see the sweet sunshine of a gracious smile, edged with scorn—as light is by its shadow, *e.g.* reproving the moribund stickler for the letter of observance of the Sabbath, who mourned that He was breaking the holy day by working a miracle to heal the man with a withered hand, He puts it to them thus: "What man shall there be of you, that shall have one sheep, and if this fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out?" and launches this at them with irresistible sense of the absurdity of such dead literalism, "How much then is a man of more value than a sheep?" (xii. 9–12). May I venture to say they must have looked very sheepish under such an exclamation? Did St. Luke penetrate still more deeply into the Lord's humour when he records (xiv. 5), "Which of you shall have an ass . . . fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day?"

There is scathing sarcasm in Christ's condemnation of the traditional get-off from consecrating means to the Lord's service by pronouncing the word "Corban" (xv. 5); but there is also ebulliency of satisfaction in laying bare the unfilial fraud. Humour was on His lips and in His eyes when He pricked that bubble of "Corban."

Most noticeable and lightly and brightly touched is the Lord's exposure of the weather-prophets (xvi. 3). Another example of grim humour that is Dantesque, is the "greater damnation" of "*long* prayers" (xxiii. 14). What looks they must have worn who heard that! Such utter traversing of their conceptions could scarcely fail to mould their faces into gargoyle-like passion. One sees it all repeated to-day when one feels constrained by the Lord's condemnation to abbreviate your wearily long and fluent ("*dreich*") praying folks.

What a genuine word-photograph, again, is there in these two portraits! (xxiii. 25) "Ye blind guides, which strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel." How ludicrous! Then (ver. 24), "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within are full from extortion and excess.' "Cleanse the—*outside* of the cup." What inexpressible humour in the picture!

Our limits do not admit of further *minutiæ*. But it seems expedient to recall, in conclusion, three ironical as well as humorous-betraying word-portraits that have been preserved by St. Luke.

(*a*) St. Luke v. 37, 38: "No man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the new wine will burst the skins, and itself will be spoiled, and the skins will perish. But new wine must be put into fresh wine-skins." None but one almost daring in His sense of humour would or could have trusted Himself by so homely and ridiculous metaphor to state His attitude towards Judaism.

(*b*) St. Luke xv. 29: Δουλεύω σοι = here am I who have been toiling and serving Thee as a slave, etc. It was the representative of the self-righteous Pharisee whom our Lord made thus to express himself; and could anything have more deftly put the character of their relations to their heavenly Father, in its bondage and self-pleasingness, in its superficial performance and low *motif*? There was sarcastic reproach of the Pharisees, as well, in respect of the hollowness of their punctilious "service" without moral values. To my mind we have here humour of a winsome sort.

(*c*) St. Luke xviii. 5. The unjust judge is represented as saying "within himself": "Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest she weary me out by her continual coming." The Revised Version so translates it, but in the margin places "bruise" (ὑπωπιάζω). It is a pugilistic term, and means literally "to strike under the eye." St. Paul also uses it in 1 Cor. ix. 27. Personally, I do not hold it correct exegesis to push etymology to its utmost,—*e.g.* Hebrew expressions for divine anger and the like so dealt with would transmute solemnity into sheer grotesquerie; nevertheless, as elsewhere, only one possessed of a vivid sense of humour would so have drawn this "Unjust Judge" and the importunate widow.

N.B.—As I was writing the above Paper, the August Expository Times reached me with its note on ὑπωπιάζω. I the more willingly say little of it here because of this suggestive "note."

Pax Vobiscum.

By the Rev. Robert Scott, M.A., Wilson College, Bombay.

Pax Vobiscum is an additional chapter of *Natural Law in the Spiritual World;* or a miniature treatise on parallel lines, with a brief preface of truer insight than the questionable philosophy of the introduction to the larger volume. It is well that readers be taught, though by reiteration, that in their soul-histories there is a chain of cause and effect. Nor in respect of style has the writer's hand lost its cunning. Though *Pax Vobiscum* suffers somewhat from lack of unity and definiteness of subject, yet some of its pages seem to us more fascinating and mature and valuable than any similar portions of the earlier publications. But the points in which we are specially interested concern interpretation, mainly of the passage (Matt. xi. 28–30) on which the address is founded, and partly of the allegory of the vine-tree (John xv.) to which more incidental reference is made, and which the author (erroneously, we think) regards as primarily a lesson on Joy. Our main difference from Professor Drummond is on the question whether Jesus, in this invitation, presents Himself as an example or as a teacher, as a companion or as a master, as an observer of law or as a giver. Curiously enough the hostile critics assume with the author that it is His mode of life, or His example of obedience, which Jesus calls on men to learn or submit to; all which is, in our opinion, the reading of a modern idea into an ancient document.

A true examination of the passage must start from a recognition of its structural character. It may be translated thus:—

> Come to me all ye labouring and loaded ones,
> And I will rest you;
> Take my yoke on you, and be my disciples,
> Because gentle am I and humble in heart;
> And you will find rest to your souls,
> For my yoke is kindly and my load light.

The first thing to note is the correspondence of lines 1 and 6, 2 and 5, 3 and 4; the second of each pair being a fuller statement of the fact or spirit of the former. In this light it is absurd to argue two kinds of rest, as it is also to build on words (such as "give") which are not in the original. Secondly, in four of the lines the thought is twofold—labouring and burdened, a yoke and a load, gentle and humble, kindly and light, yet the reference is in each case probably single. A heavy cart is to the bullocks at once an effort in the yoke and a burden that weighs down. The Master is at the same moment mild and lowly. Even the rest has its twofold expression, not only as *verb* and *substantive*, but in the second case as distinctly soul-rest. The form "humble in heart," which is an amplification for the same purpose, is in the distinctive manner of the First Gospel (Matt. v. 3).

Now, waiving the question whether, except in the matter of enduring persecution, the imitation of Jesus is anywhere taught in the New Testament, if we suppose that Christ here puts Himself in contrast with Moses, then His word (which the writer, who most fully imbibed the Galilean teaching, describes as "the perfect law of liberty") is in contrast with the older law witnessed to by scribe and Pharisee, which, in the words of Peter (Acts xv. 10), was to that age and ages before it an intolerable yoke and burden. Thus the "yoke" of Christ would represent Christianity regarded as a rational and spiritual religion, and in adaptation to our walk and work in life, while the "rest" would include relief from harassing prescriptions, and the satisfaction now experienced in mind and in heart. And this supposition meets all the requirements of the passage. Further, applying the metaphor, the difference between us and Professor Drummond may be put thus: Is Jesus here imagined as one of the two bullocks yoked together, or as the driver? In our opinion He is the driver. His yoke is the yoke He imposes. To suppose that Jesus makes, moulds, fashions, or adjusts, and then *wears* the yoke, is, as it were, to make the bullock primarily a skilled artisan. Oriental metaphors are not mixed in this way.

The misfortune of this view of ours is that it withdraws that immediate connection of humility and rest on which Professor Drummond finely and truly insists; yet it re-establishes these milder graces as traits both of the Master and His method, of the Legislator and His laws, of the King and His kingdom. And it may be doubted if the Professor is exactly right when he traces the sources of unrest and of rest. "Pride, selfishness, ambition"—these master-passions are the elements of Milton's *Satan*, and we believe that he (as well as Ruskin and others) was right in regarding pride as deeper and darker than either of the other two (ferocity or sensuality) of the infernal triad—Satan as worse than Moloch or Belial. Yet this supremacy of pride—rendering it the source of innumerable evils—unfits it to be regarded as the distinguishing cause of unrest. The *rest* of which Professor Drummond writes—what St. Paul calls the *peace of God*—is frustrated rather by fear, or doubt, or

care; against these the Bible places a firm and prayerful trust (Isa. xxvi. 3; Phil. iv. 6, 7). It may be added that a similar promise is given in Jeremiah (vi. 16) for a return to the good old paths of integrity and uprightness. And for us gathering the new law from an old book whose charm is largely embodied in the image of Jesus, it may be that the secret of soul-rest can best be found by a loving, personal imitation; yet for the Teacher to have described Himself to His pupils as a pattern of obedience rather than a master and monarch (paying homage to the past more than inaugurating the future) might well have seemed a lowering of the Messianic claim.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

NEW DEPARTURE.

HAVING chosen for systematic study—

GENESIS in the Old Testament (the early chapters), and
EPHESIANS in the New Testament,

We invite our readers—so many of them as discover the need and the opportunity—to study with us either of these Books or both of them. In the issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1891, two sets of examination papers will be published upon each of these books, four sets in all.

1. The first set of questions will take Dr. Dods' *Commentary on Genesis* as basis (Clark's *Handbooks for Bible Classes*, 2s. 6d.) up to page 27, *together with such papers upon the early chapters of Genesis as appear in* THE EXPOSITORY TIMES *from the December issue* (see Dr. Lumby's introductory paper) *to the issue for May*. No knowledge of Hebrew will be expected.

2. The second set of questions will take Delitzsch's *New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i. (T. & T. Clark, 10s. 6d.) as basis, to the end of p. 204, including the Introduction, and such papers as appear in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, as stated above. An elementary knowledge of Hebrew will be counted upon.

3. The third set of questions will take Moule's *Commentary on Ephesians* (*Cambridge Bible for Colleges*, 2s. 6d.) or Agar Beet's *Ephesians* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1890, 7s. 6d.), including the Introductions and Appendices, together with such papers as appear on Ephesians in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from December to May. No knowledge of Greek will be expected.

4. The fourth set of questions will take as basis either Meyer's *Commentary on Ephesians*, with Introduction and Notes, or the same portion of Ellicott's *Commentary* (Longmans). Some knowledge of Greek will be expected.

Any person may take Nos. 1 and 3, or 2 and 4, but not Nos. 1 and 2, or 3 and 4. The questions may be answered with the free use of these books and papers, or with the assistance of any other books at command. But it will be impossible to answer them well without careful *study* of the portions named.

For the best papers the Publishers will offer books of value, as formerly, those to Nos. 2 and 4 being of more value and of a higher class than those to Nos. 1 and 3.

But, in addition to these, we have proposals to make for more immediate practical work.

Books will be offered *every month*—

1. To the Ministers and Members of some particular Church only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or an Address on any passage occurring in Genesis i.–xi.

2. To all and sundry, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Accordingly, we offer books this month—

1. To the Ministers and Members of the Presbyterian Churches only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or Address on any passage in Genesis (Chapters i.–xi.). The Notes must not occupy more than half a column of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, this type. They should be after the nature of the "Methods of Treatment" in the *Great Text Commentary*, *i.e.* readable in themselves.

2. To all, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians. No restriction as to length or manner of treatment will be made at present. The original Greek may be referred to or not as convenient.

The best papers will be published every month in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES; and when the writers see them there they may send to the Publishers for the book they select, out of a list which will be given. The number and value of the books will depend upon the success of this scheme of work. The writer's name and address should be given, but no names or initials will be published except of those whose papers are printed, and who do not express a desire to the contrary. The papers intended for March must be received by the Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B., by the 10th day of February, and so on for every succeeding month.

Those whose papers are found in this issue will kindly let the Publishers know which of the following books they wish sent to them:—

Delitzsch's *Iris: Studies in Colour and Talks about Flowers.*
Ahlfeld's *Voice from the Cross.*
Ewald's *Syntax of the Hebrew Language.*
Beck's *Pastoral Theology.*
Monrad's *The World of Prayer.*
Rothe's *Sermons for the Christian Year.*

Index to Modern Sermons and Expositions.

ROMANS.

i.—Expositor, 3rd Series, iii. 241 (Godet).
i. 1.—Alexander (W.), Bampton Lectures, 1876, 207.
Brooks (G.), Outlines of Sermons, 354.
Ewald (H.), Old and New Test. Theology, 254.
Fairbairn (A. M.), The City of God, 215.
Farrar (F. W.), Early Christianity, ii. 32, 33.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Galatians, 52, 82.
Maurice (F. D.), Life, ii. 417.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., ii. 12.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 155, 707.
Christian World Pulpit, xxvi. 104 (Macdonald).
,, ,, ,, xxxi. 220 (Lewis).
Church of England Mag., lxv. 384 (Dalton).
Homiletic Review, xvi. 539 (Kinnard).
Studies for the Pulpit, ii. 147.
i. 1–5.—Homilist, xlii. 123.
i. 1–6.—Monthly Interpreter, i. 23 (Morison).
i. 1–7.—Expositor, 1st Series, ix. 105, x. 149, xi. 309, 458.
Homilist, xvii. 108 (Thomas).
i. 2.—Pfleiderer (O.), Paulinism, i. 212.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., i. 376.
Wright (C. H. H.), Ecclesiastes and Modern Criticism, 213.
Methodist S.S. Record (1890), Nos. 164–169 (Fletcher).
Thursday Penny Pulpit, vi. 1 (Fletcher).
i. 3.—Brown (J. B.), The Risen Christ, 161.
Cremer (H.) Biblico-Theological Lexicon, 52, 462.
Fairbairn (A. M.), Studies in the Life of Christ, 37.
Godet (F.), New Test. Studies, 264.
Laidlaw (J.), Bible Doctrine of Man, 78.
Neander (A.), Life of Christ, 19.
Pfleiderer (O.), Hibbert Lecture, 54, 142.
,, Paulinism, i. 125, 132, 151.
Robinson (W.), Biblical Studies, 114.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., i. 343, 399, 405.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 233.
i. 3, 4.—Milligan (W.), The Resurrection of our Lord, 241.
Smeaton (G.), Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, 72.
Christian World Pulpit, (1890), xxxvii. 241 (Liddon).
Church Bells (1890), xx. 348 (Liddon).
Church of England Pulpit (1890), xxix. 217 (Liddon).
Church Times (1890), xxviii. 376 (Liddon).
Expositor, 1st Series, x. 149 (Morison).
,, 2nd Series, i. 53 (Matheson).
Family Churchman (1890), xviii. 169 (Liddon).
i. 4.—Alexander (W.), Bampton Lectures, 1876, 79.
Ewald (H.), Old and New Test. Theol., 282, 327.
Farrar (F. W.), Early Christianity, i. 352.
Green (T. S.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 84.
Irving (E.), Prophetical Works, ii. 480.
Liddon (H. P.), Divinity of our Lord, 39.
Neander (A.), Life of Christ, 17.
,, Planting of Christianity, ii. 184.
Pfleiderer (O.), Hibbert Lectures, 54, 55, 142.
,, Paulinism, i. 125, 152, 159, 274.
Pusey (E. B.), Nine Oxford Sermons.
Salmon (G.), Introduction to the N. T., 398.
Steinmeyer (F. L.), Passion and Resurrection, 285.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., i. 399, 402, 408, 436.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 235, 297, 460.
i. 5.—Beck (J. T.), Pastoral Theology, 28.
Harless (C. A.), Christian Ethics, 130.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Galatians, 135.
,, Essays on Supernatural Religion, 237.
Pfleiderer (O.), Paulinism, i. 164.
Pusey (E. B.), Christian Faith and the Atonement.
,, University Sermons.
i. 5.—Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 86.
Symington (G.), Doctrine of the Atonement, 342.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., i. 391, ii. 12
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 232, 474.
i. 5, 6.—Monthly Interpreter, i. 364 (Morison).
i. 6.—Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 243.
i. 7.—Davies (J. L.), The Christian Calling, 89.
Macdonald (J. M.), Writings of St. John, 409.
Pfleiderer (O.), Paulinism, i. 212.
Reeve (J. W.), Forty-two Sermons, 127.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Morning by Morning, 187.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., ii. 2.
Westcott and Hort, Greek Test., ii., Appendix, 108.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 294.
Expositor, 1st Series, ix. 210 (Farrar).
Sermons for Sundays and Festivals, 2nd Series, iii. 44.
i. 8.—Barrett (A. C.), Companion to the Greek Test., 234.
Binney (T.), Sermons from the Penny Pulpit, 235.
Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, i. 219.
Pfleiderer (O.), Hibbert Lectures, 139.
Salmon (G.), Introduction to the N. T., 456.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 168.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 473, 720.
i. 9.—Godet (F.), Old Test. Studies, 34.
Green (T. S.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 222.
Laidlaw (J.), Bible Doctrine of Man, 331.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 563.
i. 10.—Farrar (F. W.), Early Christianity, ii. 507.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 172.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 374, 470.
i. 10, 11.—British Weekly Pulpit, ii. 11 (Tipple).
i. 11.—Norton (J. N.), Short Sermons, 445.
Vaughan (C. J.), Rest Awhile, 1.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., ii. 11.
Freeman (1889), xxxv. 211 (Maclaren).
Homilist, xlviii. 206.
i. 11, 12.—Christian World Pulpit, v. 184 (Pearsall).
Penny Pulpit, New Series, iii. 329 (Brock).
i. 11–15.—Homilist, lv. 334 (Goodall).
i. 12.—Neander (A.), Planting of Christianity, i. 130.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 55.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 722.
i. 13.—Barrett (A. C.), Companion to the Greek Test., 234.
Roberts (A.), Companion to the Rev. Ver., 106.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 163, 164.
Winer (G. B.) Grammar of N. T. Greek, 549.
i. 13, 14.—Neander (A.), Planting of Christianity, i. 281.
i. 14.—Anderson (W.), Discourses, ii. 118, 159.
Arnot (W.), Roots and Fruits, 370.
Beck (J. T.), Biblical Psychology, 63.
Church (R. W.), Human Life, 143.
Robertson (F. W.), Sermons, i. 162, 174.
Shedd (W. G. T.), Sermons to the Spiritual Man, 385.
Taylor (W. M.), Contrary Winds, 186.
Christian Treasury, xxiii. 36 (Bonar).
Christian World Pulpit, xvii. 305 (Fraser).
Clerical Lib., Three Hundred Outlines, 122.
Homiletic Review, xviii. 130 (Rankin).
Family Treasury (1865), 669.
Homilist, xviii. 280.
i. 14, 15.—National Preacher, xxxiii. 133 (Beman).
Pulpit, lvi. 409 (Noel).
i. 15.—Kirk (J.), Sermons, 137.
M'Cheyne (R. M.), Additional Remains, 431.
,, ,, ,, Basket of Fragments, 119.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 79.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 289, 294.
Thursday Penny Pulpit, vii. 217 (Irons).

i. 16.—Alexander (W.), Bampton Lectures (1876), 207.
Alford (H.), Quebec Chapel Sermons, ii. 176.
Arnold (T.), Sermons, ii. 54.
Barry (A.), Sermons at Westminster, 187.
Bellew (J. C. M.), Sermons, iii. 326.
Channing (W. E.), Works, 222, 288, 304.
Dykes, (J. O.), Gospel according to St. Paul, 1.
Farrar (F. W.), Early Christianity, i. 147, ii. 40.
Fraser (J.), Scotch Sermons on Old Lines, 203.
Gibson (J. M.), Sermons, 97.
Hannam's Pulpit Assistant, ii. 322.
Harless (C. A.), Christian Ethics, 145.
Liddon (H. P.), University Sermons, ii. 242.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Galatians, 26.
Lindesie (A.), Gospel of Grace, 128.
M'Cheyne (R. M.), Memoirs and Sermons, 440.
Martensen (H.), Christian Ethics, ii. 207.
Neander (A.), Planting of Christianity, i. 106, 169, 187.
Newton (R.), Sermons, 180.
Pfleiderer (O.), Paulinism, i. 167.
Taylor (W. M.), Ministry of the Word, 143.
Tyng (G. H.), Law and Gospel, 272.
Wace (H.), Christianity and Morality, 1.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., ii. 8, 19, 53.
Wieseler (K.), Synopsis of the Four Gospels, 298.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 310, 721.
Christian Treasury, xxiv. 84 (Bonar), xxxi. 217 (Fairbairn).
Christian World Pulpit, ii. 200 (Winter), iv. 364 (Barfield), xxi. 72 (Barry), xxii. 57 (Kennedy).
Church of England Mag., xi. 112 (Harte), liv. 113 (Lester), lxx. 184 (Harding), lxxiii. 184 (Richardson).
Clerical Lib., Three Hundred Outlines, 123, 124.
Homiletic Quarterly, i. 96 (Jones).

i. 16.—Homiletic Review, xviii. 523 (Guinness).
Homilist, viii. 519, xxvi. 155 (Pryce).
National Preacher, xxi. 101 (Ide).
Pulpit, lvii. 421 (Hoare), lix. 537 (Melvill).
Studies for the Pulpit, ii. 72.
i. 16, 17.—Symington (G.), Doctrine of Atonement, 439, 450.
Christian Treasury, xii. 109, 125 (Edmond).
i. 16–18.—Preacher's Magazine, April 1890 (Gregory).
i. 17.—Alford (H.), Sermons on Christian Doctrine, 281.
Bernard (T. D.), Bampton Lectures (1864), 148.
Binnie (W.), The Psalms, 214.
Cremer (H.), Biblico-Theological Lexicon, 271.
Delitzsch (F.), Old Test. Hist. of Redemption, 133.
Dykes (J. O.), Gospel according to St. Paul, 13.
Ewald (H.), Old and New Test. Theol., 244, 440.
Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, v. 354, 358.
Lightfoot (J. B.), Galatians, 138, 156.
Matheson (G.), Moments on the Mount, 83.
Orelli (C. von), Old Test. Prophecy, 326.
Pfleiderer (O.), Paulinism, ii. 167, 174.
Salmon (G.), Introduction to the N. T., 525.
Simcox (W. H.), Language of the N. T., 86.
Spurgeon (C. H.), My Sermon Notes, ii. 354.
Wace (H.), Christianity and Morality, 169.
Weiss (B.), Theology of the N. T., ii. 10, 53.
White (E.), Mystery of Growth, 234.
Winer (G. B.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 170, 232.
Wood (W. S.), Problems in the N. T., 57.
Christian Treasury, xviii. 228.
Christian World Pulpit, xiv. 222 (Ireland), xxxvi. 248 (Fairbairn).
Homiletic Quarterly, iii. 567 (Macgregor).
Pulpit, lviii. 331 (Holmes).
Sunday Magazine (1882), 419.

By-paths of Bible Knowledge.

Two volumes of the series "By-paths of Bible Knowledge" have recently been issued by the Religious Tract Society, each at the price of half a crown. The one is *Early Bible Songs*, by A. H. Drysdale, M.A. (1890, 192 pp.); the other, *Modern Discoveries on the Site of Ancient Ephesus* (1890, 128 pp., illustrated), compiled from the late Mr. J. T. Wood's scarce quarto on that subject with the help of additional MSS. Neither volume comes properly under the title of the series, for Mr. Drysdale's is no by-path but a direct thoroughfare to Bible knowledge, while Mr. Wood's, if we may call it his, scarcely leads to Bible knowledge at all.

The early Bible songs, which Mr. Drysdale discusses, are (1) the Song of Moses at the Red Sea (Exod. xv. 1–18); (2) the Farewell Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 1–43); (3) the Song of Deborah (Judges v.); (4) Hannah's Song (1 Sam. ii. 1–10); (5) David's Evensong (2 Sam. xxiii. 1–7); and (6) four Secular Songs, as he calls them, viz. the Song of the Sword (Gen. iv. 23, 24), the Song of the Well (Num. xxi. 17, 18), the Song of the War-Flame (Num. xxi. 27–30), and the Song of the Bow (2 Sam. i. 17–27). It is something to have all these songs gathered together in one handy volume with a good, practical, popular exposition upon them. But the best thing in Mr. Drysdale's book is the introductory chapter on Shîr, or Song-Poetry in general, and Hebrew Song in particular. That chapter has the makings in it of a useful, popular lecture.

The story of the late Mr. J. T. Wood's excavations at Ephesus, which were crowned with the discovery of the temple of the great goddess Diana, was worth telling over again. But we have here more than was told before, and especially of the work and the worry which fall to the lot of an Eastern explorer under the paternal government of the unspeakable Turk. We have read the little book throughout with genuine interest, and shall quote one short paragraph to which a recent event has given an added interest. It was in the early months of 1870, and Mr. Wood had made his great discovery, and laid bare a considerable area down to the pavement of the earliest temple:—

"I was one day superintending the works and standing on the pavement, when I saw an active figure moving rapidly along the edge of the excavations towards the sloping road leading down to the bottom of the excavations, and in a few seconds I found myself face to face with an intelligent man of middle size, who introduced himself to me as Dr. Schliemann. Looking around him, he exclaimed in excited tones, 'So this is the *veritable* pavement of the temple of Diana? Let me shake hands with you, Mr. Wood; you have immortalised yourself.' Dr. Schliemann then confided to me his great project. He said he had studied Homer, and he was inspired with the wish to find Troy, and he felt convinced he would find it. He asked me if I thought the Turks would give him leave to go to work. I told him of the manifesto which had then been recently issued by the Sublime Porte, declaring that no more firmans for excavations would be granted. 'But,' said Dr. Schliemann, 'I should not want to keep anything I found, I would give all to the Turks; I can afford to spend out of my income £1500 a year.' I then expressed my opinion that on those conditions he would not be refused a firman."

"The New Apologetic."

The New Apologetic; or, the Down-Grade in Criticism, Theology, and Science. By Professor Robert Watts, D.D., LL.D., Assembly College, Belfast. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

This is one of those masterly productions which have made Professor Watts not only famous but formidable, and for which he deserves the thanks of all the Churches. The leaders of the down-grade movement, with which the volume deals, may conveniently ignore the author, or quietly smile at him, but they will hardly dare to meet him in single combat. This is not a book of consecutive chapters on a given subject, but rather a series of successive articles on subjects closely related both in thought and theology. It is a very elaborate, trenchant, and scathing review of the criticism, theology, and science of such scientists, specially, as Darwin, Le Conte, and Drummond, and of such critics and theologians as Drs. Robertson Smith, Dods, and Bruce in Britain, and Bushnell and Barnes in America. Its object is at once to reveal and to arrest this down-grade, which is shown to be due mainly to two principles—Evolution in science and Rationalism in theology. The down-grade leaders in theology proceed on the principles of the Evolution theory and of the Positive philosophy, which lead to Rationalism in criticism and theology. The logical result of the application of such principles to science and theology is clearly shown to be negative Agnosticism or naked Pantheism in the one case, and Rationalism or Socinianism in the other.

First of all, all living organisms are said truly to be the evolution of primary cells, but these cells are not held to be ultimately the outcome of primary organisms; and such biblical doctrines as divine revelation, the plenary inspiration and absolute perfection of Scripture as originally given; the primary moral perfection of man, and his temptation and fall as a historical fact or objective reality, the penal satisfaction of Christ to the justice of God and justification by His objective and imputed righteousness, are so minimised and even mutilated as to lose their place and truth and worth in Scripture. The doctrine of the New Apologetic in regard to all these truths is fully discussed and disproved and shown to be the apology of concession or surrender. Professor Watts as readily admits a certain kind and measure of development as he stoutly denies the Evolution theory of Darwin, and especially of his disciples, some of whom have transcended and even travestied their master. He will acknowledge the scholastic maxim *ex nihilo nihil fit*, or the necessity of creation and a subsequent progress in the history of the globe from lower to higher forms of life, and also the development of one thing into a higher of the same kind or species or a certain modification of species; but he maintains and shows that the development of one thing or kind into a different kind, or the transmutation of one species into another species, has not only never been scientifically proved but is contrary to the facts of geology and biology, which do not reveal causal continuity in nature. Such a theory must be held to be as unscientific as the transmigration of souls is unscriptural.

Next, the critical methods of these scientists and theologians are shown to be at once illicit in beginning with the objections to a doctrine instead of with the evidence for it; imperfect, as proceeding on the fallacy of a partial induction of the facts or phenomena, specially in ignoring the claim of Scripture to plenary inspiration; and even assumptive in taking for granted that the alleged errors of the present text existed in the original autographs or Scriptures, and thereby ignoring the fact that most of these discrepancies have been already reconciled by a riper scholarship, and that, as Dr. Hodge affirms, there is not an instance of proved error in Scripture. It must be added that such views not only tend to unsettle men's minds in vain, but invalidate the claim of the written word to infallibility, and end in setting up finite human reason as the ultimate standard or judge of all scientific and religious truth. The consequence is that some of those truths of science and theology which we receive on ample evidence, but cannot comprehend, are being denied and discredited. We must notice, in this connection, that Dr. Robertson Smith and, in particular, Professors Dods and Bruce are dealt with as neither Scriptural nor scientific theologians, but rather as one-sided speculators, seduced by a vicious critical method, by philosophical pre-suppositions and pre-conceived ideas of certain Christian doctrines, and of the terms or conditions of human salvation or Christian character. Dr. Watts then demonstrates by a course of diversified and cumulative argument that the low view of inspiration, which would admit or leave room for errors and immoralities in the original Scripture, and which distinguishes between the inspiration of the substance and of the form of it, cannot be limited to any one class of subjects, doctrinal or historical; that, if carried to its logical consequences, it would be equally valid against the correct original communication of truth to the mind of the recipient as against his correct statement or report of it; that the Scripture teaches expressly that the sacred writers not only received the substance of their communications but the form, and both together, or that they not only thought, but spoke and wrote, being moved by the Holy Spirit; and, more especially, that the eternal Logos Himself, as the grand Prophet of the Church, was anointed by the Holy Spirit beyond

measure to qualify Him for the full and efficient exercise of His office as the Revealer of God. Here also we must add that a view of inspiration which would make the character or truth of Scripture depend on the subjective state or moral character and progress of the recipients and writers would not only vitiate and invalidate all Scripture, and be inconsistent with the confessional doctrine of its infallible truth and Divine authority, but also that, as the Supreme Teacher, He Himself wrote nothing, but left His work to be done by fallible men, an inerrant or infallible revelation, written or spoken, except the Decalogue itself, would be impossible.

Professor Watts is careful to notice in this connection that the supplementary corrective of the down-grade theologians to their view of the primary errancy of Scripture, viz., the testimony of the Holy Spirit, is not only absurd, as implying that the Spirit was more necessary to the reception than to the record of a Divine revelation, but is also a misconception of His work, which is in this respect to deal with men's minds, and not with the matter or form of Scripture. The work of the Spirit is not directly to prove the truth of Scripture, but to give a fuller persuasion of its truths, which is said in the Confession to rest on prior external and internal evidence sufficient to convince unbelievers, by which also the Spirit bears witness to our spirits, and apart from which our belief of the infallible truth of Scripture would rest on mere authority without evidence, and the grand basis or bulwark of our holy faith would be the logical fallacy of *hysteron proteron*, or assurance first and evidence next; while the religious consciousness, which is ecclesiastical Mysticism and neological Rationalism, would become the ultimate test of the truth of revelation.

The author then examines the way in which the New Apologists deal not only with Scripture itself but with Scripture facts and doctrines, specially their denial or at least disparagement of the primary perfection of man and of an objective historical temptation and fall; of the penal satisfaction of Christ for sin to the justice of God, which is more than a mere moral atonement or display of God's love to sinners; and justification by faith in the objective and imputed righteousness of Christ, and not as Arminians say, by our subjective faith accepted for righteousness, or, as Bushnell states, by the character of God imparted to us, or by our subjective repentance and faith as in themselves righteousness. All these methods of justification by subjective feeling are as baseless and false as justification by works, and nothing less than mere forms of Rationalism or Socinianism, the articles of declining theologians and falling Churches.

Professor Watts evidently believes that the Confession of Faith needs no revision of substance or form; that this proposal springs from Arminian and rationalistic sympathies, which will not long maintain the Calvinistic system of doctrine; that the Revisionists are not superior in real learning to the authors of the Confession, but are often ludicrously ignorant of the history of the Standards, and thereby of the Standards themselves.

This volume is the work of a master in Israel, who has a giant's strength but does not exercise it, like a giant, tyrannously. If Dr. Watts, in concert with other defenders of the faith, should succeed in arresting the present down-grade in theology, he will be the honoured instrument of Britain's rescue from Rationalism, as the late noble Dr. Cooke and others were of Ireland's deliverance from Arianism in the North and Unitarianism in the South and West.

JAMES SCOTT.

Exegetical Papers.

Gen. i. 2 compared with 1 Kings xxii. 21.

BY THE REV. A. H. WRATISLAW, M.A.

IT has often been remarked that controversialists of the Reformation epoch, and indeed controversialists of all times, appear to have a strong tendency to use the Scriptures rather as a storehouse from which to draw proofs for their own views, than as documents from which their views themselves have to be drawn. This reading of theology into Scripture has had a baneful effect upon the science of theology itself, in that it has caused current views on revelation to be taken and accepted for revelation itself, and orthodoxy has come to be tested, not by what the Bible really says, but by what people, in their eagerness to know more than is actually told, have thought fit to read into it.

It may not unreasonably be contended that an instance of this is found in the treatment which

the last clause of the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis has received. It is well known that רוּחַ in Hebrew and *πνεῦμα* in Greek are ambiguous or equivocal words, admitting equally of the translations "wind" and "spirit," spirit itself being an abbreviation of the Latin "spiritus," which—from the root of "spirare"—signifies a breathing or blowing of air.

In the Hebrew the clause runs as follows:—

וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם׃

'And wind or spirit of God moving upon the surface of the waters." In the LXX. we read, *καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος*, "And wind or spirit of God was moving over the water."

Josephus, *Ant.* I. i. 1, alters the construction of the sentences, and in his paraphrase writes: *πνεύματος δ' αὐτήν* [evidently *τὴν γῆν*] *ἄνωθεν ἐπιθέοντος*. This is, of course, a traditional view of the passage current in his day. And, it must be remembered, that he was a Pharisee, not inclined to deny the existence of angel or spirit, but to confess both (Acts xxiii. 8).

Now, in the Hebrew and in the LXX. the "spirit of God" and the "wind of God" are grammatically equally admissible, whereas the paraphrase of Josephus allows only of the translation "wind." I translate the passage of Josephus *in extenso*. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And this [latter] not coming under sight, but being concealed by deep darkness, and wind coursing over it from above, God commanded light to come into existence."

As to the expression "wind of God," it would probably mean a "mighty wind," just as in 1 Sam. xiv. 15 a "trembling of God" is used for an "exceeding great trembling." I do not cite the well-known expressions "mountains of God" and "cedars of God" for lofty mountains and cedars, because in them the word for God is *El*, not *Elohim*, as in the passage under discussion and in 1 Sam. xiv. 15.

The paraphrase of Josephus would seem to indicate a word-painted picture, representing a kind of "darkness visible," in which there was nothing distinguishable but land and water, not yet separated, and wind moving or coursing over them. In the Hebrew and LXX. water is represented as being above the earth and "wind moving upon the surface of the waters."

Now, is this a fitting passage for us to read into it the doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity, who is supposed to be represented as visibly brooding, moving, or hovering over the surface of the waters? To me it appears entirely out of keeping with the passage itself and with the series of word-painted scenes representing the days of creation which follow it.

It is not necessary for my purpose to raise a special discussion upon the word מְרַחֶפֶת, which will bear more translations than one without, in the slightest degree, affecting my argument, and that the more as I do not pretend that I can add anything of moment to what has been already said about it.

Let us compare the use of רוּחַ here, as suggested by Josephus's paraphrase, with another passage, in which, unfortunately, we shall not obtain any assistance from Josephus. That passage is 1 Kings xxii. 21. There the A.V. and R.V. give in the text the self-same words, but the latter adds a marginal note, which completely upsets what it places in the text. I transcribe the whole as given by the R.V.

Michaiah said to Ahab: "Therefore hear thou the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on His throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left. And the Lord said, Who shall entice Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth *a spirit*, and stood before the Lord, and said: I will entice him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth and will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And He said, Thou shall entice him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets; and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee." "There came forth *a* spirit and stood before the Lord." Here the margin of the R.V. calmly says, "Heb. *the* spirit." I am quite at a loss to understand how *a* spirit and *the* spirit can be of identical signification. The LXX. certainly gives *πνεῦμα* without the article, and Josephus, unfortunately, omits the entire scene in heaven. But if we are to take the Hebrew as our guide, we must cast about for some other way of taking the passage, which shall not force us to defy grammar by making "*a* spirit" and "*the* spirit" identical. It is abhorrent to propriety to understand "*the* spirit" as the Holy Spirit of God; we must therefore betake ourselves to the only other course left open to us, and translate, "And there came forth *the wind*, and *stood before* the Lord, and said, I will entice him. And He said, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth and will be a lying wind [*or* spirit] in the mouth of all his prophets."

Here we have as marked a transition from the sense of *wind* to that of *spirit*, as in the conversation between our Lord and Nicodemus (John iii. 8). No propriety either of sense or grammar is outraged, and we have merely the wind personified in the vision and allowed to go on a message of delusion.

One of the most striking passages, in which

wind is made to denote the failure of prophecy and the delusion of the prophets, is Jer. v. 13: "And the prophets shall become *wind*, and the word is not in them."

For the appearance of the *wind* before God, I may cite Zech. vi. 5, where, when the prophet inquires the meaning of the vision of the four chariots with differently coloured horses, the angel replies: "These are the four *winds* (R.V.) of heaven, which go forth from *standing before* the Lord of all the earth."

Note on Genesis i. 2.

We often speak of the Six Days of *Creation* as given in the Mosaic account, and thereby fall into very serious error (as I conceive) regarding the entire biblical cosmogony. The mistake arises from the mistranslation of one short Hebrew word, rendered in our version "was" (verse 2). But היתה in the Hebrew signifies "became," not "was," —which very considerably modifies the meaning of the whole passage. It is true that the LXX. render ἦν, and the Vulgate by *erat*, but this should not stand in the way of an accurate translation being given.

I would render the first three verses, then, thus:

Originally (cf. John i. 1) *God created the Heaven and the Earth.*

2 ¶ *And the Earth became waste and unfurnished, and darkness was over the face of the abyss.*

3 *And the Spirit of God moved upon the waters' face.*

Now we have an entirely different picture. God "created" all things, "originally," in a state of *perfection;* for we have no warrant to conceive otherwise. This is the subject-matter of verse 1. Then—and no hint is given as to how long that original state may have lasted—the earth became waste and unfurnished [LXX. ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος; Vulgate, "inanis et vacua"], emptied (so to say) of all its first perfection, probably by sin and its terrible results. This is the subject-matter of verse 2. Aeons untold may have elapsed between the creation of "things seen," by the hand of the King—eternal, immortal, invisible—and the subsequent confounding of that goodly work by the agency of some awful sin, which brought about the catastrophe. We are not told *what* caused it precisely; but, from several hints scattered up and down the Bible, we may conjecture that in all probability the fall of the angels ("that kept not their first estate"), with Satan at their head, was the real reason. But this has not definitely been revealed, and therefore it is not needful for us to trouble much about the matter.

What are called the "Six Days of *Creation*" will now more rightly be named the "Six Days of *Restitution;*" when the light of God, long withdrawn from the ruins of a creation that had been stained by sin, returned, and Chaos became Cosmos. (Cf. the strikingly confirmative passage in Isaiah xlv. 18, God created it [*i.e.* the earth] not a *waste.*)

It is by this interpretation that, finally, I believe Science and Scripture may be reconciled; the ordinary interpretations are absolutely helpless to bring about such an end. Any way, this interpretation throws a new light upon much that is obscure, as I venture to think; and as it has been of real value to myself in understanding—or trying to understand better—the earlier verses of Genesis, it is given herewith, in case it may prove of use to others.

EDWARD HENRY BLAKENEY.

Trin. Coll. Camb.

Ephesians vi. 14.

"Having girded your loins with truth."—R.V.

Why should the girdle be first mentioned? And why should it be identified with truth?

Let us first understand our Greek. The aorist participle points, of course, to a single action done once for all. The girding done once is to be done for good. In other words, truth is to be our constant companion. ὀσφύς I should be inclined to consider as almost equivalent to the "small" of the back (Hdt. 2. 40, Aesch. Pr. l. 497, where opposed to ὦμοι, v. Liddell and Scott s.v. Yet note that application in both cases to *animals.*). It is meant to represent the most important part—the pivot, so to speak, of the body—which most needs wrapping up and protection, and so is used for the whole. Compare, for a curious analogy, the provincialism—to "put your back into" anything. Truth again (ἀλήθεια) is etymologically = openness or frankness, that which leads one to have nothing hidden or concealed (ἀ λανθάνω).

To sum up then the whole phrase: (1) we are to be girt once for all (not requiring constant renewal); (2) the part we are to gird is at once one of the most important of the human frame, and one which requires the most assistance; (3) the girdle is to be an open and a frank spirit—truth is to give to the soul what the girdle does to the body, assistance and comfort.

Once more. In the East we must remember that the girdle is of primary importance. To the Oriental with his flowing robe to be ungirt is practically the same as to be useless. The girdle is here mentioned first because it is the first necessity for Eastern activity. Compare, for instance, the story of Elijah, who, *after girding himself,* runs before Ahab's chariot to the gates of Jezreel.

Finally, *truth* is mentioned as being the foundation of all other virtues, and of the first necessity in approaching GOD. Before we can come before HIM we must put off self (lies, hypocrisy, etc.), and put on truth. Without the guileless nature which hideth nothing, we have not taken the first step towards communion with HIM.

Zoroaster saw this many years before the coming of Christ, and the beauty of his cult lies in the stress laid upon this virtue. The Egyptians understood it, for their priests wore the sapphire image of truth around their necks. And what is, in any case, the most ancient, if not the most correct, interpretation of the mysterious Urim and Thummim of the old dispensation points them out as signifying respectively light and truth (LXX. δήλωσις καὶ ἀλήθεια). L. L. BARCLAY.

Genesis ii. 16, 17.

"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

The revealed will of God is a restraint on men.

In the case of Adam the restraint was in *one* thing. With us, the restraint is in *many* things.

From the text I observe—

1. *That God restrains man from nothing that is essential to his well-being or enjoyment.*—The fruit allowed to Adam was abundant, and in great variety. Only one tree was forbidden, and that he did not require. Everything is lawful that is good for us. We have liberty, but not licence. The use of things, but not their abuse. What is forbidden is harmful; licentiousness, covetousness, theft; selfishness in all its forms.

2. *That things forbidden stand in the midst of things allowed.*—The tree of knowledge was in the *midst* of the garden, easy of access. The bad ever lies near to the good. A thing in moderation is good; in excess bad. Covetousness lurks behind frugality; severity behind duty; a vain ambition lies near the lawful desire to serve; lying is often near to kindness; formalism to reverence; abuse to use.—Discretion and watchfulness are always necessary.

3. *That the penalty of violating God's law is death.*—The words, "the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," are probably a warning, not a threat. They were uttered in kindness. As water drowns, fire burns, so sin kills. We need not assume that there was poison in the fruit of the tree. Taking the fruit would be disobedience, unbelief, defiance, sin, which is deadly poison. Disobedience is death, killing the soul first, and through the soul the body. An act of transgression separates the soul from God; beclouds and confuses the moral nature; is destructive of innocence, purity, and self-respect; and obliterates heaven from the soul's prospect. This, in Bible phraseology, is death. "The wages of sin is death."

J. GASKELL.

The Religious Literature of the Month.

BOOKS.

Three Great Fathers.

MESSRS. LONGMANS have published *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers*, by William Bright, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford (crown 8vo, 6s.). The three great Fathers are Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Augustine, who receive forty-eight, sixty-one, and seventy-four pages respectively, after which there come one hundred and twenty-eight pages of valuable appendices. The book opens with a singularly clumsy preface, containing single sentences which fill whole pages, and in one of which we have counted, not without labour, ten separate statements. But when the subject proper is entered upon, all this is speedily forgotten. There is energy in the writing, delicate sympathetic insight in the thought, and proportion in the arrangement. It proves itself a most pleasant and helpful guide to the study of these three mighty ones.

The Practical Teaching of the Apocalypse.

From MESSRS. LONGMANS there comes also *The Practical Teaching of the Apocalypse*, by the Rev. G. V. Garland, Rector of Binstead, Isle of Wight (8vo, 16s.). It is a handsome octavo, whose 498 pages are made up of thirty-six chapters, and two short appendices on the "Eternity of Matter" and the "Symbolic Meanings of the Apocalyptic Numbers." For the most part each chapter of the Apocalypse receives a chapter of the book to its elucidation, and special points are dealt with separately. There is no discussion of authorship, date, or composition. The moral and spiritual lessons of the Apocalypse are brought to bear upon modern times and modern places by a large and generous application of the symbolical method of interpretation. No one will deny the justice of applying that principle of interpretation to any book of Scripture, and least of all to this. But is there any other that demands the same rigorous self-restraint in its application? Mr. Garland presses into his service elements of doubtful advantage. Thus etymology plays some considerable part; but it is etymology of a bewildering description. "*Amnos*, a lamb, appears to be derived from the Hebrew Amen, the truth." "The Keltic London, 'the fort in the marsh,' may bear also another interpretation, in its possible derivation from the Hebrew, 'the lodging-place of judgment,'" and so become identified

with Babylon the Great. There are philologists still who connect Semitic and Aryan words; one has recently offered the derivation of the word "Aryan" itself from the Hebrew *ari*, a lion, as if the Aryans were the royal Semites, the lions of the tribe of Judah. But sober scholarship is all against it at present; and Mr. Garland's etymologies weaken his interpretation.

The Creed in Scotland.

MESSRS. W. BLACKWOOD & SONS have published *The Creed in Scotland: An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed*, by James Rankin, D.D., Minister of Muthil (crown 8vo, 7s. 6d). The book (which is got up in the best Edinburgh style) opens with two introductory chapters on "Creed History," and "The Creed in Scotland;" and then enters upon an exposition of the Apostles' Creed. Each article is dealt with in a separate chapter, and in the most thorough way. Every word or phrase is examined in the light of Scripture, of history, and of recent literature; then extracts are given from Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism of 1552, and from Calvin's Catechism of 1556; and a selection of Latin and other hymns concludes the chapter and the article.

Karl Sell's Lectures.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK have issued *The Church in the Mirror of History: Studies on the Progress of Christianity*, by Karl Sell, D.D., Darmstadt, editor of the "Life and Letters of H.R.H. Princess Alice" (crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.). The translation is by Elizabeth Stirling. To the translator is due the present title, the original being *Aus der Geschichte des Christentums*. It is a volume of 250 pages, and contains these six lectures:

1. Primitive Christianity.
2. The Early Catholic Church.
3. The Middle Ages.
4. The Reformation.
5. The Counter-Reformation.
6. Christianity during the last Century.

The book has had a great run in Germany, for it is popular in the only right sense of that word—clear, firm, attractive, scholarly.

Gethsemane.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK have also issued a new devotional work by Mr. Newman Hall—*Gethsemane: Leaves of Healing from the Garden of Grief* (crown 8vo, 5s.). A brief prefatory note points out its mission:—

"This book is the fulfilment of a long-cherished purpose. It expresses the thoughts and prayers of many years, and is published with devout desire to minister consolation to some of the afflicted children of God. The author asks that the metrical pieces, some of which are selected from his *Songs of Earth and Heaven*, may be regarded, not as quotations, but as integral portions of the present series of meditations."

The Biblical Illustrator.

By MESSRS. JAMES NISBET & Co. another volume is issued of *The Biblical Illustrator*, by Joseph S. Exell, M.A. (8vo, 664 pp., 7s. 6d.). The book of Scripture is Genesis, and this volume covers the first seventeen chapters, in the same way, and with the like wealth of illustration, as previous volumes of the series.

Men of the Bible.

MESSRS. NISBET also send three newly issued volumes of the series "Men of the Bible." They are *Isaac and Jacob*, by Canon Rawlinson; *St. Paul*, by Professor Iverach; and *Gideon and the Judges*, by Dr. Marshall Lang (crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. each). The names of these writers will command the confidence of readers, though we must say that the first is at present running some risk. But we shall deal with the books separately in a little.

Why am I a Christian?

MESSRS. A. & R. MILNE, Aberdeen (Edinburgh: Andrew Stevenson), publish an exceedingly chaste booklet, by the Rev. John Philip, M.A., Fordoun—*Why am I a Christian?* (small 4to, 6d.). It is possible that there are those who, if they were to ask this question with Mr. Philip's candour, should find themselves exclaiming, "Why, I am *not* a Christian!" This is, perhaps, one purpose of the little book. For, then, will they not ask more seriously, "Why *am* I not a Christian?" It is a good confession Mr. Philip makes, to be understood of all. It will do good.

The Death of Christ.

MR. ELLIOT STOCK has published *The Doctrine of the Death of Christ, in Relation to the Sin of Man, the Condemnation of the Law, and the Dominion of Satan*, by the Rev. Nathaniel Dimock, A.M. (8vo, 7s. 6d.). We read the papers as they appeared in the *Churchman* last year. But there is much new matter here, and especially an appendix of ninety-two pages, which consists of quotations bearing on the theology of the death of Christ, carefully chosen from representative Christian writers from the second century to the fifteenth. Thus Mr. Dimock's great contention "that the atonement is the effect, not of the incarnation of Christ, but of the death of the Incarnate Son of God," is supported by a long and a strong chain of authority. The book, though it might have been made easier of access by a good index, will be at hand for constant reference.

The Letter of the Larger Hope.

MR. ELLIOT STOCK also sends *The Letter of the Larger Hope*, being a rendering into modern English of the First Epistle General of St. Peter, by John W. Owen, B.A., St. Paul's, Adelaide (8vo, 112 pp.). "This little volume is, I believe, the first book on biblical criticism ever brought out in South Australia," says the Dean of Winchester, who contributes an Introduction that does more for the book than merely lend a name, that does really introduce it in a most interesting fashion. We have in the volume, first, a new and thoroughly modern translation of the Epistle; then, textual illustrations and running analysis in either margin; a fuller statement of the argument under each section; and, finally, a series of notes which sometimes expand into short essays. It is Oxford scholarship face to face with the new life of a fast-growing colony.

PERIODICALS.

How to Prepare an Expository Sermon on the Life and Works of Stephen.

To the *Old and New Testament* for January, Professor G. B. Stevens, of New Haven, contributes a short paper under the above heading, grouping his suggestions under two heads:—(I.) The Gathering of the Material; and (II.) The Use of the Material for the purpose of the Sermon.

I. (1) Read carefully through all notices of Stephen and his works in Acts vi. 5 to viii. 2, xi. 19, xxii. 20. (2) Ascertain the significance of such facts as that he was (*a*) a deacon in the Church, and (*b*) a Hellenist. (3) The occasion and subject of his disputes with the Jews. (4) The Jews' accusations against him; their probable grounds. (5) Seek out any expressions or hints in Stephen's address before the Sanhedrin which may throw light on the ground of their accusations against him. (6) Consider the effect of his martyrdom on the course of events in the Church (see especially chap. xi. 19). (7) Study his work as a preparation for the work of Paul.

II. On the basis of such a study a discourse could be prepared upon Stephen's life and character as an illustration and incentive to Christian fidelity. If the design was to make it strictly expository of the brief scriptural notices about Stephen, the order of thought indicated above could be followed with a little adaptation. If the sermon were to approach nearer to the topical plan of treatment, the same material, at least in the main, could be used according to some such outline as this—(1) Introduction upon the critical relations at this time between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, and upon the increasing opposition of the unconverted Jews to Christianity. (2) Stephen's adaptation to meet the emergencies of this crisis. (3) His ability to learn from history (Acts vii.) lessons applicable to the present time. (4) His fitness to be the forerunner of Paul, the great champion of Gentile freedom, and the fearless censor of Jewish unbelief. (5) His faithfulness to his convictions and to his duty, even unto death, as an example and proof of the saying of one of the Church Fathers that "the blood of the martyrs is seed."

The Coming Minister.

The Rev. Dr. Gregg, who succeeds Dr. Cuyler as pastor of the Lafayette-Avenue Church, Brooklyn, has made, says *The New York Evangelist*, a distinct hit with his first sermon. It was living, telling, evangelical. His text was 1 Tim. iv. 6, "A good minister of Jesus Christ;" and he announced as his theme, "The Coming Minister: Shall he be? and What shall he be?" To the first question he replied that (1) the Gospel ministry is a Divine ordinance, and carries with it a Divine and outreaching promise; and (2) it is a necessity of human nature. To the question, What shall the coming minister be? he replied: First of all, a man of God, and his call from God will appear to him in this—his inability to choose any other pursuit. Next, the coming minister will appreciate the achievements of the past, but be himself of the century in which he lives. Third, he will be a preacher of the Book and of its Christ; and, fourthly, he must be a man of faith and character.

NEW MAGAZINES.

The New Year always has its new ventures.

Religious Review of Reviews (6d., 15 York Street) has not satisfied the critics. Perhaps the editor, not being a Stead, did not realise what it meant to read and review all the religious magazines; print, correct, and arrange his own, and have it out before the middle of the month. We wish him better success next time.

The Ladder (6d., Marshall), under Mr. David Balsillie's editorship, is a more leisurely product, and thoroughly deserving. It succeeds the Social Pioneer, takes even higher ground, and will most assuredly, if it can maintain that ground, prove a great force in education.

Onward and Upward is the journal of the Haddo House Association, and is edited by the Countess of Aberdeen. This first issue is full of life.

Pray and Trust (1d., Dundee) is a little monthly, edited by Mr. James Smith, of the Dundee Y.M.C.A. Its earnestness and generous sympathy are most commendable.

The Evangelical Magazine, having commenced its ninety-ninth volume, is scarcely to be classed here. Yet it is, to all intents and purposes, a new magazine. Under a new editor it enlists a new staff, gives the word "evangelical" a new definition (by Mr. Horton), and opens a new career. Here is the editor's manifesto, which, did we need a manifesto, we could adopt for ourselves, and especially in its latter part:—

"In sending out the first number of the new volume, the editor desires to express his determination loyally to uphold those evangelical principles which are so dear to British Christians. While keeping within the old lines, he believes that greater freedom may be given to expression of views on those questions which are to-day regarded as of supreme importance. It must not, therefore, be concluded that he is responsible for all the views expressed by contributors. So far as possible every article will be signed, and it must be distinctly understood that only the writers are responsible for their respective contributions. The golden sentence, 'In things essential, unity; in things doubtful, liberty; in all things charity,' has for nearly a century been, under successive editors, the key-note of *The Evangelical Magazine*, and it will still rule its melodies.

"The editor must ask contributors to cultivate the art of brevity. He has no leisure to look through long articles, and he doubts if readers have patience to read them. The Rev. Dr. Mather wrote over his study door, 'Be short.' Will friends who write for *The Evangelical Magazine* kindly take this for their motto? Life is short. Time is short. Patience is short. Learn to condense and intensify; thus two sentences will be put into one, and three words into two. There is much truth in what Sydney Smith once sa 'After you have written an article, take your pen and strike out half the words, and you will be surprised to see how much stronger it is.'"

Printed by Morrison & Gibb, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April will contain the first of a series of critical and expository articles on the early chapters of Genesis, by Professor Herbert E. Ryle, Cambridge.

Two interesting communications respecting "the Spirits in Prison" have reached us since last issue. The importance of the passage is not less than its difficulty; and for that reason it is well that every one should make an effort to reach an explanation which shall be in accordance with an accurate knowledge of the language and teaching of the Word. We shall retain these notes meantime, with the hope of returning to the subject soon.

The Newbery House Magazine for February opens with a well-informed and temperate article by the Rev. F. F. Irving, B.A., on "The Attitude of Catholics towards Biblical Criticism." Touching first on the necessity of *some* criticism, Mr. Irving quotes the Vulgate reading *ipsa* of Gen. iii. 15 (*Ipsa conteret caput tuum*, "*She* shall bruise thy head"). "It can hardly be denied that this reading has commonly been regarded by our Roman brethren as giving scriptural support to much of the more exaggerated teaching as to the office of the Blessed Virgin. It is certainly the ground of the peculiar prerogative attributed to her in the title 'Destroyer of all Heresies,' which is, in fact, merely an extension to times subsequent to the Incarnation of the words *ipsa conteret caput tuum;* and, further, it is the only *biblical* authority for the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, in support of which it has been, and still is, extensively used. Compare, for example, such an admirable work as Schouppe's *Elementa Theologiæ*, where it is advanced without note or comment as the first and practically sole scriptural proof of the doctrine. And yet not Cardinal Franzelin alone, as Messrs. Addis and Arnold allow in their *Catholic Dictionary*, but all competent Roman Catholic critics, as shown by Dr. Pusey in his *Eirenicon*, on the authority of the learned De Rossi, acknowledge that it must be surrendered as a false reading in favour of *ipse*."

Mr. Gladstone returns to Professor Huxley and the Miracle at Gerasa in the *Nineteenth Century* for February. Even the *Spectator* is amazed at the "elasticity" of which the article is an evidence. It *is* marvellous. Most of the authorities are examined at first hand, and with a discrimination which means close and watchful study; the points are skilfully chosen; and the whole argument is massive and masterly. On his own ground Professor Huxley has been answered. But we need not say that we believe the ground to be mistaken. Mr. Gladstone seems himself to be conscious of this. "The first question that arises," he says, "in approaching this inquiry is, where did the miracle take place? And I do not well understand how Mr. Huxley, or his authorities, have so readily arrived at the conclusion that the very existence of any place named Gergesa is very questionable." Then, after giving Origen's testimony, he adds: "This statement from such a source, at such a date, appears to require a treatment much more careful than the dictum that

the existence of Gergesa is 'very questionable.' I admit, however, my obligation under the circumstances to inquire also, and fully, into the case of Gadara."

It is not difficult to see why Professor Huxley says the existence of Gergesa is very questionable. No such name was heard of till Origen suggested it, in place of the Gerasa which he found in [almost] all the MSS. of his day; and that it appears in certain MSS. since his day is probably due to his influence. The hamlet named Gerasa by the Lake of Galilee may have temporarily dropped out of sight in his day (an easily explicable event), or changed its name, and when he found that name in his MSS. he could think only of Gerasa in Gilead, thirty miles away—an impossible place. Others had already proposed Gadara (really also impossible, though not so manifestly); Origen suggested Gergesa, which may have been the name by which the real hamlet was then known, or the name of some neighbouring hamlet, or a pure supposition suggested by the Girgashites of the Old Testament. Professor Huxley may therefore reasonably doubt the existence of Gergesa, but not of Gerasa.

In a letter to the *Academy* of February 7, Professor Sayce makes known for the first time the origin of the name Jerusalem. A cuneiform tablet made us acquainted long ago with the fact that *uru* signifies "city," the Assyrian *alu*. Now the latter part of the name has been found in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, in which are preserved the letters which Ebed-tob, Governor of Jerusalem sent to his suzerain the King of Egypt, a century before the Exodus. Salim, says Ebed-tob, was the name of the local deity worshipped on "the mountain of Jerusalem." Thus Uru-Salim, or Jerusalem, must be "the city of Salim," the god of peace. We can thus understand, adds Professor Sayce, why Melchizedek, the royal priest, is called "King of Salem" rather than of Jerusalem; and we may see in the title "Prince of Peace," conferred by Isaiah on the expected Saviour, a reference to the early history of the city in which he lived.

"The Higher Criticism,"—but is it not time to drop that unmeaning adjective? It is true that Eichhorn deliberately rejected the word "historical," because it did not cover the whole ground. But the ground is not so wide now. The Higher Criticism, as he named it to distinguish from the Lower or Textual Criticism, included in his day both literary and historical criticism; that is to say, an examination of the *language* of the books of the Bible, and an inquiry into their *historical contents*. And for many a day that double-edged weapon was skilfully and fearlessly employed to discriminate authorship, date, and reliability. But that which once seemed to yield the surest results—the language of the different books—has been found deceptive and unreliable. To-day it may almost be said there is no such thing as a literary criticism.

"The Higher Criticism," said the late Principal Rooke, "is not to be evaded or ignored; it has come among us to stay." Already his words are finding their fulfilment. Very little that is first-rate in temper and ability has yet been written on either side in this country, but a great deal of some sort is written every month; the editors of even the popular magazines have discovered that it is a subject in which the public take an interest; and men of recognised ability and fairness are coming forward to guide what can no longer be stayed or stifled.

The most recent and a very notable contribution to the literature of the subject is a little book by Professor Sanday of Oxford—*The Oracles of God* (Longmans, 1891, 4s.). In one of its earliest pages, we find this reference to Delitzsch: "A very significant fact was the conversion of the veteran Delitzsch, who died on March 4 of this year at the age of nearly seventy-seven, substantially to the new views. A man of extraordinary learning and of deep piety, he had all his life long contended for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, until first, in two preliminary essays published in 1880 and 1882, and then in the fifth edition of his Commentary on Genesis, published in 1887, he threw over this, and without admitting any change in his religious convictions he practically went over to the other side." Dr. Sanday is not himself such an instance of conversion to the new views. Never an opponent of the Higher Criticism, for his studies have lain in another direction, he is not now its

advocate. But he recognises "a change of front as to the nature of God's revelation of Himself in the Bible, and especially in the Old Testament, or more accurately, as to the nature of the methods by which that revelation has been conveyed . . . a change in regard to the conception of the Old Testament as the vehicle of revelation," and he seeks to estimate the loss as well as the gain in this change; for "there may be loss as well as gain; and yet I cannot but think that the gain will be found to overbalance the loss, and that all things—even the progress of criticism—still work together for good to those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

It is not the Historical Criticism alone that has wrought this change. The discoveries of the archæologists in Egypt, Palestine, Assyria, and Babylonia have done something towards it. "In many respects the result of these discoveries has been to confirm the truth of the Old Testament history—in many, but not quite in all." So Dr. Sanday believes. It is a question by itself of very great moment, and though still somewhat hot, might advantageously be opened up to sight by the men who are competent for it, but it is merely touched upon here. For, in Dr. Sanday's judgment, "of more far-reaching significance are the results obtained—or at least thought to be obtained—from the critical investigation of the Bible itself."

Principal Cave has said in his recently issued *Battle of the Standpoints* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1890, 6d.) that the burden of proof lies with the higher critics; and undoubtedly one of the most urgently pressed demands is a plain statement, if it can be made, not merely of the results arrived at, but of the facts and inferences which are relied upon in reaching these results. But there are those who cannot bring themselves even to look at the proofs. They cannot enter this field, because it seems to them that since our Lord quoted the Pentateuch under the name of Moses, and the Psalms under the name of David, in passing through the gate they should have to trample upon the authority of Jesus Christ. Dr. Sanday believes that this is a mistake, and regrets that the controversy respecting the criticism of the Old Testament should have taken that unfortunate turn. "The true method in this and in all cognate questions is first, at all costs of time and labour, to ascertain what are the exact facts. When that has been done, the explanation of the facts will come almost of itself. We shall see them in their true proportions, and they will fall into their proper place and relation to each other. It is the reverse of this to take a single text, to draw from it at once far-reaching dogmatic consequences, and so to foreclose by an appeal to authority the whole line of detailed investigations. It is needless to say that even the effect which is sought will not be attained. The investigations will go on all the same. And meanwhile they will be conducted under prejudice on both sides, and when they have reached their conclusion the shock of collision between the opposed opinions will be all the greater."

Still the feeling is there; present to some degree in most men's minds; overpowering and altogether prohibitory in some. Dr. Sanday recognises this; and though he regrets the order in which it has come up, thinks the question must now be faced. Two different solutions have been suggested; and it may confidently be affirmed that no other will be suggested. For it cannot be that after the enormous correspondence of recent months on this subject, a new idea should still be latent somewhere. The suggestions are (1) that Christ accommodated His language to the current opinions of the Jews of His day regarding the Old Testament Scriptures; or (2) that His human knowledge was really restricted on such subjects. It is possible, indeed it is very easy, to bring forward even serious objections to both views. Dr. Sanday, after planting his feet firmly on a clear declaration of the Godhead of Christ, chooses the latter.

There is no English periodical that gives so much attention to questions of Old Testament Criticism as the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (London: D. Nutt, 3s.). Its articles are always well forward on the critical side; they are always perfectly candid, and they are conspicuous for ability and ripe learning. To the current number (published in January) Mr. C. G. Montefiore, one of the editors, contributes a paper of forty pages on the three great continental critics, Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Stade,—all of whom he discovers to be both inconsistent and inconclusive in what they say on

a subject confessedly one of the most difficult in the whole range of the Higher Criticism, the relation between the religion of the prophets and that of the historical books which precede them.

Mr. Montefiore points out that the Higher Criticism finds three salient features in the religious doctrine of the prophets. 1. Their religion is practically monotheistic. To Amos, Yahveh is not only the God of Israel, but of the world. Moab He punishes as well as Israel. To Isaiah the Assyrian monarch is but the rod of Yahveh's anger; the idols are things of nought. 2. The prophetic religion is an *ethical* monotheism. Yahveh's action is governed by righteousness and mercy, combined into a unity that is self-consistent and unalterable. Israel is His chosen people, and or that very reason must suffer defeat and even exile because of its sins. 3. This unique God is to be served, according to the unwavering doctrine of the prophets, on the negative side by a complete renunciation of all idolatrous and superstitious practices; upon the positive side by the practice of social morality. No magical rites, no material representations of Yahveh are to be tolerated.

No other gods but One; who is a righteous God; and who will be worshipped with clean hands and a pure heart, — these are the three leading features in the religious teaching of the prophets of the eighth century B.C. But in significant contrast to these, criticism discovers certain passages in the Historical Books. One of the most striking is David's complaint (1 Sam. xxvi. 19), that if he is driven from abiding in the inheritance of Israel he must serve "other gods," as if he conceived the range of Yahveh's influence not to extend beyond Palestine. Again, such passages as 1 Sam. vi. 19; 2 Sam. vi. 7, xxiv. 1; Judges v. 11, vii. 20, are held to represent Yahveh as taking part in the struggles of Israel, not in an ethical but in a purely natural sense. And then, in contrast to the third feature of prophetic doctrine, the very leaders of the people are said to be represented in Judges, Samuel, and Kings as engaging in superstitious and magical practices, like the casting of the lot and the care of Teraphim.

Now if these things are so, the question arises, How do the prophets know a religion so immensely superior to that of even the rulers of the people in the previous century? Two answers have been made. One that the historical period of the Judges and Kings was a distinct decline from the purer Mosaic period; the other, that the Mosaic religion was still lower and ruder; that there was a gradual development from the Mosaic to the prophetic era, and that Moses stood upon the lowest rung of the ladder of which Amos stood on the highest. The latter is the answer given by the Higher Criticism of to-day as represented by Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Stade. For Kuenen, who once (as in his *History of Israel*) held the Decalogue to be Mosaic, placed the religion of Moses on a higher ethical level, and regarded the idolatry of the historical era as due to the fact that the people in general had never learned the higher conception of Yahveh's nature, has in recent years departed from that position, and is now in practical agreement with Wellhausen.

But the difficulties which stand in the way of this theory are very obvious and very serious. As Mr. Montefiore points out, "the prophets never put forward what they have to say as a hitherto unheard of novelty. They appear to assume that what they preach is the legitimate religion of Israel, while the popular religion is an aberration and a falling away. The beginnings of nation and religion are alike assigned to the exodus from Egypt" (see Amos ii. 10–12; Hos. xiii. 4, xii. 14; Isa. i. 21, 26; Jer. ii. 2, 3). "But it is not merely the sudden appearance and splendour of the prophets which upon this hypothesis becomes difficult of adequate solution. We find it hard to realise how the religion of the national God was preserved at all. If, when the Israelities entered Canaan, the Yahveh whom they worshipped was not superior to the gods of the Canaanites, one would have imagined that Yahveh would either have disappeared altogether, or that the monotheistic impulse would have entirely broken down. For the Canaanites were superior to the Israelites in external civilisation. The former were agriculturists and dwellers in cities; the new comers were nomads and shepherds. We know that the Israelites adopted a good many of the Canaanite rites; we know also that there went on a considerable process of assimilation between the two kindred races. Why did not the greater absorb the less? Why did not Yahveh succumb to Baal?"

Dr. Martineau's "Messianic Mythology."

By the Rev. Professor S. D. F. Salmond, D.D.

There are two Dr. Martineaus, and it makes a world of difference with which we have to do. There is Dr. Martineau, the Theist—the man of positive faith, the thinker of constructive gift, vindicating as few can the reality of the moral intuitions and the being of God. And there is Dr. Martineau, the Unitarian—the man of negations, the critic of destructive faculty, attenuating Christianity, and dissolving the beliefs which have been the inspiration of the Christian centuries. In previous works of larger order, especially the *Types of Ethical Theory* and *A Study of Religion*, we have the former Dr. Martineau holding out a hand that we can grasp with prompt and cordial gratitude. In these we hear the persuasive voice of a teacher who wins at once our trust and honour, who discovers to us the eternal foundation of things, to whom we owe much for his spiritual philosophy, his assertion of the truth of conscience and the sovereign law of duty, his defence of the Theistic faith against an aggressive Materialism. But, in the book which gives us the ripest issue of the thoughts of his lengthened life, it is the other Dr. Martineau who presents himself, and forces us into the unwelcome position of antagonism and strenuous protest. It is an ungracious task to speak of assumptions and fallacies, failures and mistakes, imperfect acquaintance with essential facts, partial handling of evidence. This, however, is the task which is imposed upon us, alas, by the gift of Dr. Martineau's old age. For these things, we are forced to say, appear in his latest work.

The *Seat of Authority in Religion* is an elaborate assault upon historical and doctrinal Christianity. It is, in the first place, an attack upon the religion of Christ, as it is admitted to have been understood almost from the time of Christ Himself. It is, in the second place, and in order to this, an attack upon the Christian records and the Protestant basis of faith. It is important to state the case so. For, unquestionably, what rules the entire reasoning of the book is a violent repugnance to the Christianity of the Churches, and to the beliefs in which, ever since Christ's voice was heard on earth, the mass of Christian people have recognised the distinctive message of the Gospel in its power and in its comfort. He has parted with these beliefs, and with his own first conceptions of Christianity. He tells us he has done so with pain. But he has parted with them absolutely. Nor is it only that he has broken with them. He has come to think of them as pernicious. He speaks of this frankly, even passionately. What the Christian world has been resting on is "an immense and widening mass of Christian mythology, from the first unstable, and now at last apparently swerving to its fall." And he adds: "Let it fall; for it has corrupted the religion of Christ into an Apocalyptic fiction—and that so monstrous in its account of man, in its theory of God, in its picture of the universe, in its distorted reflections of life and death—that if the belief in it were as real as the profession of it is loud, society would relapse into a moral and intellectual darkness it has long left, and the lowest element of modern civilisation would be its *faith*" (p. 325). This is sufficiently strong. Yet it is no momentary outburst. We have measureless denunciation of the Christianity of the Christian ages again and again; and, in his closing paragraphs, we have the tremendous indictment repeated in equally absolute terms, and in a way that indiscriminately and most unjustly mixes up things which greatly differ. "The blight of birth-sin," he says, "with its involuntary perdition; the scheme of expiatory redemption with its vicarious salvation; the incarnation with its low postulates of the relation between God and man, and its unworkable doctrine of two natures in one person; the official transmission of grace through material elements in the keeping of a consecrated corporation; the second coming of Christ to summon the dead, and part the sheep from the goats, at the general judgment;—all are the growth of a mythical literature, or Messianic dreams, or Pharisaic theology, or sacramental superstition, or popular apotheosis. And so nearly do these vain imaginations preoccupy the creeds that not a moral or spiritual element finds entrance there, except 'the forgiveness of sins.' To consecrate and diffuse, under the name of 'Christianity,' a theory of the world's economy, thus made up of illusions from obsolete stages of civilisation — immense resources, material and moral, are expended, with effect no less deplorable in the province of religion than would be, in that of science, of hierarchies and missions for propagating the Ptolemaic astronomy, and inculcating the rules of necromancy and exorcism" (p. 650).

So starting from the Unitarian position, Dr. Martineau has travelled far beyond aught that Unitarianism once contemplated, and has added negation to negation. Abandoning the original Unitarian conception of the person of Christ, he

*

has given up, along with that, the entire Messianic vocation of Christ, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and all the distinctively Christian doctrines connected with these. His contention is that instead of the religion taught by Jesus Himself, which was a simple, ethical religion, and one in which He made little or no claim for Himself, there was substituted at a very early period a peculiar theory *about* Jesus, what He was and what He did; that this was from the first a false theory; and that its falsehood and injuriousness became more conspicuous as it was continued and developed by the Church. The Confessions of the Churches, in short, "make Him into the object instead of the vehicle and source of their religion; they change Him from the 'Author,' because supreme Example, into the *End* of faith; and thus turn Him, whose very function it was to leave us alone with God, into the idol and incense which interpose to hide Him." He concedes that there may have been some excuse for the invention of this theory and the honour given it. It may have been needed in order to "conciliate the weakness of mankind." But it has long ceased to serve any such pedagogic purpose. It now "alienates their strength." It may once have helped to "give to Christianity the lead of human intelligence, to secure first mastership in the schools, authority in the Court, and the front rank in the advance of civilisation." But now it "reverses these effects, irritating and harassing the pioneers of knowledge, compelling reformers to disregard or defy it, and leaving theological thought upon so low a plane that minds of a high level must sink to touch it, and great statesmen and grave judges and refined scholars are no sooner in contact with it, and holding forth upon it, than all robustness seems to desert the intellect, and they drift into pitiable weakness" (pp. 339–360).

To make good this bold contention and prove that the Christianity of the Church is not the Christianity of Christ Himself; that from its very beginning it was something only remotely related to that, and continues to be something essentially distinct from it; that in truth it is but a vast edifice of mythology, which must be destroyed and put out of the way for the good of the race, is an arduous task for any one to face. How does Dr. Martineau grapple with it? At times in an uncertain and well-nigh perfunctory fashion, and at times with a great expenditure of strength, but a strength that is misdirected. It is a remarkable thing that, on some of the most vital issues, his argument is at once the feeblest and the most lacking in freshness. On the Resurrection of Christ, for example, he has nothing of his own to give us. He simply repeats the old reasonings which are so familiar, which have been so often met, and which have been recognised to be inadequate by reputable inquirers who have no prepossessions in favour of the doctrines or doings of the Churches. How did the belief in a risen Christ arise? It was due, says Dr. Martineau, not to the fact that Christ actually did rise, but simply to the "enthusiasm of trust and love" with which His disciples regarded Him, which, though "beaten back by the tragedy of Calvary, was sure to reassert its elasticity." One might imagine that some adequate stimulus or occasion for this was needed, especially as the "enthusiasm" so "reasserted" had to act quickly and become the creator of the belief that Christ had risen. Dr. Martineau seems to feel this, and where finds he the stimulus? — In the return of the stricken disciples to Galilee and the northern scene which recalled His image. But would not this extraordinary revolution in their thoughts at least demand some time? Yes, says Dr. Martineau, at least the time for "the consolidation of this belief must be considerably extended." And how does he secure it? In the first place, by the surprising assertion that the return to Galilee meant a walk of 150 miles! And, in the second place, by simply telling us that "nothing forbids us to allow whatever time may be required," any fancied necessity for the opposite being imposed only by the "later conception of a bodily resuscitation." The entire phenomena, indeed, are purely matters of the "inward chronometry" of the disciples' souls. What they did believe in, too, was only that Christ *lived*. Even to Paul it would have made no difference "if the Jewish authorities had rifled the tomb and publicly replaced the body on the uplifted cross" (p. 370). But what of the testimony to their having *seen* Christ? No doubt, says Dr. Martineau, they did say that they had *seen* the risen Christ; and he adds that "had they not been able to do so, they could hardly have conveyed to others the profound assurance of His heavenly life, which, in their own minds, so largely depended on the impressions of their personal experience." But all these appearances of the risen Christ which are reported are "the *effect* of their faith in the immortal Christ," not its cause. They are so many psychological facts in the consciousness of a few of His immediate followers; and if this explanation of them is difficult to reconcile with the evangelic narratives, these narratives must so far go by the board. There Dr. Martineau leaves us, with a far feebler perception of the problem, and a far weaker attempt to grapple with it than we have in Ewald and Keim.

The great Christian beliefs expressed by the terms *Incarnation*, *Atonement*, *Judgment* are similarly disposed of. Space does not admit of any

detailed criticism of his method of consigning these to the limbo of the mythologies. He deals with them all as speculations of the New Testament writers, which any student of history can now easily account for. In the case of the Incarnation there is a somewhat elaborate, and by no means uninstructive attempt to trace the connections of the *Logos* doctrine. But the incarnation of a Divine person is a "kind of fact which transcends all evidence, and which human testimony never can approach." So the question is left, without any attempt to face the problem created by Christ's own testimony to Himself. The view of Christ's person which is given in the Fourth Gospel is pronounced to be not historical, but "an idealisation of the evangelistic traditions," an idealisation which, as the figure of the real Jesus receded into the distance, quite naturally "formed itself in the mind of His disciples, and spoiled them for the simplicity of its first impression."

But nowhere do we see Dr. Martineau in greater straits, and nowhere is his method of dealing with the problems of the New Testament more surprising than in his treatment of the Messianic doctrine. He seems to exhaust his vocabulary of strong and stinging terms in repudiating the Messianic view of the Jesus of history. It is the beginning of Christian mythology. The Messiah is but the "figure of an Israelitish dream." The belief in Jesus as the Messiah is the theory which has "coloured and distorted" the Gospel narratives. It is allowed, indeed, to be a belief which has served a remarkable purpose in providence. For without it we should in all probability have had no Life of Jesus at all. It was "the needful vehicle for carrying into the mind and heart of the early converts influences too spiritual to live at first without them. It has saved the Hebrew Scriptures for religious use in the Christian Church, instead of leaving them no home but the Jewish Synagogue." If we have memoirs of Jesus at all we owe them "to the very theory which has so much coloured and distorted them." But the theory itself is utterly false and injurious. How injurious it has been, in Dr. Martineau's estimate, Dr. Martineau can scarce find words to express. It is "the first deforming mask, the first robe of hopeless disguise, under which the real personality of Jesus of Nazareth disappeared from sight." It is the theory that has "corrupted the interpretation of the Old Testament, and degraded the sublimest religious literature of the ancient world into a book of magic and a tissue of riddles. It has spoiled the very composition of the New Testament, and, both in its letters and its narratives, has made the highest influence ever shed upon humanity subservient to the proof of untenable positions and the establishment of unreal relations."

If unmeasured language could solve intractable and unwelcome problems, these sentences, and others of like kind, should make quick work of some inconvenient questions which Dr. Martineau has to face. What is the problem? And how does he meet it? The problem is this—We know that the Jews of Christ's time expected a Messiah; we know, too, what kind of Messiah they looked for; and we know, further, that within a comparatively short period after His death the belief in Him as the promised Messiah greatly prevailed, and though it implied a total revolution of the hereditary idea of the Messiah, it took possession even of men like Paul, and became the theme of their preaching and the inspiration of their lives. How could this faith originate and prevail if the Jesus of history was the Jesus of Dr. Martineau—a Jew who did no miracles, but simply taught a pure morality, and spoke of God, and died an ignominious and premature death, and did not rise from the dead? This is the obvious problem, and it is one so serious and difficult that Strauss freely owned that this faith in Jesus as the Messiah is not to be comprehended if He did not Himself implant it in the minds of His first disciples. Different replies to this problem have been proposed by students of the life of Christ. What is Dr. Martineau's solution? It is that the "identification of Jesus with the Messiah was the first act of Christian mythology;" that He Himself never claimed to be Messiah; that the Messianic theory of His Person was made for Him, and palmed upon Him by His followers. This is indeed a bold and unusual position. How does he seek to justify it? He points to what he calls "several slight but speaking indications," which seem to him to infer it. They are certainly "slight," as he very fitly terms them, and so precarious that it is only by a series of large assertions that he makes them in any degree plausible. He has to strip the title "Son of God" of its Theocratic or Messianic force. In order to this, he has to assert that the title received that force from the Christians themselves; that its Messianic interpretation in the second Psalm was a "purely Christian invention;" and, that "neither in the true text of the anterior Apocalyptic literature, nor in the Hebrew Scriptures, does it ever appear in that sense." As regards the Gospels, it is pronounced to be a title which is applied to Jesus by the oldest of the four only in the case of beings of superhuman insight. The case of the high priest (Mark xiv. 61, 62) is reasoned away as an improbability. It is set aside, in short, as a posthumous predicate of Jesus. But even when this is done, Dr. Martineau is only at the beginning of his difficulties. Nothing is effected unless he is able also to remove the expression "Son of Man" out of his way. But this cannot be done by declaring it a posthumous title. He has to admit that this was the expression habitually used by Jesus when He spoke of Himself. He acknowledges it to be of such importance that

on it depends the question as to "the range and character of His self-conscious mission." He makes the further admission that, to the Evangelists, it was a Messianic term. His object, consequently, is to show that the Evangelists' use of it was not historically true; the Messianic meaning being "a Christian after-thought, thrown back upon the personal ministry of Jesus." With this in view he pronounces the testimony of the Book of Enoch inconclusive, on the ground that the relative section may be a Christian interpolation, and the testimony of the Book of Daniel equally so, on the ground that we cannot determine whether "the misinterpretation of these visions which appropriated the phrase 'Son of Man' to a supposed personal head of the theocracy was pre-Christian, and furnished the disciples in Palestine with a familiar Messianic 'title.'" As regards the frequent occurrence of the term in Ezekiel with the individualised sense, he thinks its force is exhausted if it is limited to the idea of the "conscious weakness, unworthiness, nothingness of the human agent, when called to be the organ of a Divine intent." And coming to its employment by Christ Himself, he takes it there to have had simply the sense which he ascribes to it in Ezekiel. It is a note of dependence and trustful self-surrender. How this is to be made to fit the passages (such as Matt. viii. 20) which Dr. Martineau seems to accept as genuine, is not apparent. But beyond those in which he makes some attempt to exhibit the reasonableness of the non-Messianic interpretation, there are many more which admittedly are impervious to any such process of sapping and mining. He has to acknowledge the fact that "in numerous discourses attributed to Jesus by the Evangelists the term is undoubtedly restricted to this [Messianic] meaning." Holtzmann surmounts this difficulty by supposing that the title is an indefinite one, intended to cover "one knows not what tender and mystical significance." But with this Dr. Martineau is not satisfied. Neither can he unite with those who fall back upon the supposition of a change in the connotation of the name within the brief limits of our Lord's ministry, the Messianic sense being absent from it at first and only added to it later. He cannot do this, because he finds discourses of the kind in question "on both sides of Peter's confession." Hence he is driven to the theory that a change in the use of the term took place between "the ministry of Jesus and the fall of the Jewish State." That is to say, the first disciples and their Palestinian converts were caught by the spirit of the time (which was a time "prolific in Apocalyptic dreams"), and worked out the idea that the Master whom they believed to live in the unseen world was to be the Messiah, and to realise in His own Person the Kingdom of God which, in His earthly career, He had announced. This is Dr. Martineau's theory. How forced and artificial an explanation it is, appears best from other suppositions which he has to make in seeking some confirmation of it. He has to suppose, for instance, that the writers of the Gospels threw back this new sense upon the term as it came from Christ Himself, and so represented Him, yet without any consciousness on their part of any liberty being taken with Him, as using it in a sense in which He did not use it. He has to suppose further—and surely this at least is a most unreasonable supposition—that they were "unaware that it was a characteristic expression of His, by which He loved to designate Himself;" and that, in this strange ignorance of His common ways of speech, they patched his discourses with "shreds of Jewish Apocalypse," and even attributed to Him "whole masses of eschatology" concerning the signs of the "Son of Man." Recognising, too, the importance of Peter's great confession at Cæsarea Philippi, he is under the necessity of making it out (by a process partly critical, partly exegetical, which we cannot stay to examine) that Peter felt Christ's reply to be a *repudiation* of the Messiahship which was then acknowledged. And yet, again, he has to empty of its testimony the great discourse on the signs of His coming and the end of the world. This discourse, as we have it, is undoubtedly Messianic, and Dr. Martineau admits that "nothing perhaps has left so strong an impression of the Messianic self-announcement of Jesus." But he distinguishes between what the Evangelists meant to convey as announced by Jesus, and what was actually announced by Him, and concludes that the discourses on the "last things," which are reported in the synoptical Gospels, are "as much Christianised Jewish Apocalypse as the Book of Revelation." He confesses that it is next to impossible to prove this, because the documents which are supposed to have furnished the interpolations have perished. On what, then, does he rely as his warrants for the conclusion? First, upon the Evangelist Luke's report of Christ's words, "Therefore said the Wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets," etc. In this he thinks he finds something analogous, *i.e.* "an example of quotations by Evangelists from an Apocalyptic writing called the 'Wisdom of God,' Jewish in essence, Christian in application, so incorporated with their biographical narrative as to be thrown back some thirty-nine years before its origin, and appear as a vaticinium *ante* eventum." As to this no one can say that it is unreasonable to suppose that a lost Jewish writing may be referred to there. In point of fact, critics of the eminence of Ewald and Bleek agree in accepting the supposition. But, on the other hand, as it is put by Dr. Martineau, it is mixed up with other suppositions far less reasonable, and it is opposed

even in its simpler form by other critics equally worthy of respect, such as Neander, Gess, and so far Ritschl. The weighty authority of Meyer, too, is against it, who is of opinion that Jesus quotes one of His own earlier sayings, and does it as if the Wisdom of God spoke by Him. He holds the other view to be controverted by the fact that it would be out of analogy with the other quotations made by our Lord Himself, as well as by the circumstance that the evangelic traditions, as appears from Matthew xxiii. 34, gave the words in question as Christ's own words. This first reason, therefore, furnishes very slender ground for Dr. Martineau's conclusion. Has he a second to adduce? Yes, he has both a second and a third. But to most readers, the mere statement of these will probably be evidence enough of the very uncertain ground on which Dr. Martineau proceeds in this part of his argument. For what are these second and third reasons? The one is the circumstance that Christ does not say "When I shall come in my glory," but "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory;" from which solemn use of the third person for the first he draws the extraordinary inference that these sayings are supplementary elements interwoven with the historical colloquies and left to betray themselves by lack of literary art in "the writers. The other is the use of the phrase the *coming* of the Son of Man." For, says Dr. Martineau, if Christ had really spoken in His Messianic capacity of the particulars of His Parusia, He would have described it not as a *coming* but as a *return*.

But enough has been said for the time being on Dr. Martineau's criticism as applied to this great term. In his venture to prove that Christ did not Himself claim to be Messiah, and that the Messianic idea of Him is a mythological idea, he has other things to explain away. For example, Paul's witness to the Messianic vocation of Christ is disposed of by the assertion that he knows only the risen Christ, and thinks all through of His heavenly life. But it is needless to go into these matters. It is enough to say that Dr. Martineau's contention that Christ did not identify Himself with the Messiah breaks down in the case which he himself admits to be the crucial case—that of the application of the title "Son of Man." Even if he were more successful with the polemic which he directs against the various occurrences which he has referred to, he would still have to grapple with such sayings as that in Mark ii. 10, in which the official sense seems too deep-seated to be so easily removed as in a footnote he attempts to do with it. But on this question Dr. Martineau has against him the authorities he would naturally desire to have on his side. He refers himself to the weighty opposition of Harnack, who declares the term "Son of Man" to mean "nothing else than Messiah," and (in opposition to Havet and certain others, who take up more or less Dr. Martineau's position) tells us that the section of the evangelical tradition which reports Jesus to have represented Himself as the Messiah is one which seems to him to stand the sharpest test of criticism. But not to weary our readers with an enumeration of the many authorities of the highest name and of different schools who are against Dr. Martineau in this matter, let us refer only to two whose opinion should carry weight, the one for his critical, the other for his literary eminence, who yet deal with this question in a way so different from Dr. Martineau. The one is Keim, who speaks of it as the name in which even at the beginning Jesus summed up His claims, and pronounces the Messianic sense to be historically established. He notices how it is objected that the condition of our sources does not warrant us in carrying back the Messianic sense at any rate to the beginning of Christ's ministry; that in any case the title may have been "obscure and equivocal;" and that, on Christ's own lips, it may have altered its force as His work advanced, taking on a deeper and more definite meaning in the later stage than it had at first. But his verdict is, that an exact historical investigation "destroys the first objection, and with it in the main the second also, and the third." The other authority that we choose to refer to at present is the author of *Ecce Homo*. In him we have a writer sufficiently free from the prejudices of the orthodox surely, and one with whom we should expect Dr. Martineau to have much in sympathy. But how different are his conclusions! He, too, has his criterion for testing the veracity of his sources. He, too, is careful not to start with more than a "rudiment of certainty." But, looking to such passages as chap. viii. 29, 30, xii. 6, xiv. 62, he concludes that Mark's Gospel furnishes clear evidence of the fact that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah. He thinks that the same fact may equally well be gathered from the other Gospels, so that we have the consent of the witnesses for it. Further, he points out that this is not a matter about which the Evangelists were likely to be mistaken, not an isolated incident which might depend upon the testimony of a single witness, but one of the "habitual acts and customary words of Jesus," one of the "public and conspicuous acts and words which it would be difficult to falsify in the lifetime and within the knowledge of those who had been witnesses of them." Christ's death, too, would be inexplicable, he tells us, on any other supposition. So his conclusion is that it cannot reasonably be doubted that this claim to be the Messiah was made by Christ Himself.

Recent Literature in Apologetics.

A GUIDE TO THE BUYING OF BOOKS.

I.

INTRODUCTION.—Thanks are due to those who have written so kindly about the first of these articles—"Recent Literature in Sermons"—which appeared in the January number. In regard to the present article, it will be understood that every contribution to recent apologetic is not found in it. Some books of value may not have been seen; some books have been seen and passed by as of no value. Some arrangement seems necessary. Were system and logic to rule, Ebrard might be followed. But we shall assert our British right to be less logical, and more immediately practical, and adopt the following rough division:—1. General and Systematic; 2. God and His Revelation (against Atheism and Agnosticism); 3. The Record of Revelation—The Old Testament; 4. Christ and Christianity.

I.

GENERAL AND SYSTEMATIC.

PUBLISHERS—W. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh.
AUTHOR—Lewis Thornton.
TITLE—Opposites. A Series of Essays on the Unpopular Sides of Popular Questions. 8vo, pp. xiv., 380. 1890, 12s. 6d.

The first page of *Opposites* ends with this sentence: "But there is really a good deal to be said on the opposite side." *Every* page might end with it. Mr. Thornton acknowledges and deplores the possession of "such a funny mind," that, like Socrates and Artemus Ward, he always sees truth "upside down"; so that the moment he is presented with any popular belief, he "rushes off at a tangent to see its opposite side, and pick holes in it." Accordingly, his aim in this volume is, "after picking the requisite number of holes in atheism, deism, positivism, spiritualism, Islamism, orthodoxy [scientific quite as much as religious], and irregular evangelism, to extract from each something which looks like a modicum of truth." It is a book for the serious as well as the curious, but it is especially for the dogmatically minded. Mr. Thornton disclaims specialism, but he is no sciolist. His criticism is often acute, and always perfectly candid.

PUBLISHER—John Murray.
AUTHORS—Various.
EDITOR—Charles Gore, M.A., Principal of Pusey House.
TITLE—Lux Mundi. A Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation. 8vo, pp. xxiv., 525. 1890, 14s. Also Preface to the Tenth Edition. 8vo, pp. xl., 526-538. 1890, 1s.

Lux Mundi has been so long in every one's mouth, that it is probably by this time in every one's hands, and needs scarcely a place here. The Appendix, however, deserves notice, both because it is essentially a palm-branch, and because it adds an essay (by Mr. Gore) on the Christian Doctrine of Sin.

PUBLISHER—Richard D. Dickinson.
AUTHOR—Joseph Cook.
TITLE—Current Religious Perils: with Preludes and other Addresses on Leading Reforms, and a Symposium on Vital and Progressive Orthodoxy. The Twelfth Series of the Boston Monday Lectures. 8vo, pp. xiv., 415. 1888.

It has come to be the fashion in this country to lightly esteem the service of the Boston Monday Lectureship. But they who were brought to their knees by the early lectures on the Atonement will refuse to follow this fashion. The lectures are not the gospel, though the gospel is in them; and therefore it is marvellous that in these latest volumes the power and the interest show no sign of falling off. Here the variety is very great, yet there is a unity discoverable. Besides Mr. Cook's own Lectures, Preludes, and Addresses, there is a symposium on Current Religious Perils, and an Appendix on Creeds and Confessions.

PUBLISHERS—James Clarke & Co.
AUTHOR—Washington Gladden.
TITLE—Burning Questions of the Life that now is and of that which is to come. Crown 8vo, pp. 248. 1890, 3s. 6d.

There is no reference in Dr. Gladden's *Burning Questions* to future punishment, though it has been flippantly said that the title suggests it. Eight great questions are answered in brief compass, but with confidence and skill, and a keen sense of present need. They are these: Has evolution abolished God? Can man know God? Is man only a machine? What is the use of prayer? Is death the end? Who is Jesus Christ? Are the Gospels fairy tales? Where is the Kingdom of God?

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.
AUTHOR—J. H. A. Ebrard, Ph.D., D.D., Translated by Rev. John Macpherson, M.A.
TITLE—Apologetics; or, The Scientific Vindication of Christianity. 8vo, 3 vols., pp. xv., 407, 423, 406. 1886-87, 31s. 6d.

Perhaps we should have begun with Ebrard. It is the only book of recent origin which offers to cover the whole field. It is the only book which even attempts to raise Apologetics to the rank of a science; and it is a pity for our

credit that it should be German in origin. It is a pity also for the sake of first impressions. But Mr. Macpherson's translation is thoroughly well done, and the first effort is speedily rewarded as the subject opens up. A large portion of the book is occupied with a study of the religions of the world. That study alone would have made it a great book, unrivalled in recent literature.

PUBLISHER—C. H. Kelly.
AUTHOR—Joseph Agar Beet.
TITLE—The Credentials of the Gospel. A Statement of the Reasons of the Christian Hope. 8vo, pp. 199. 1889, 2s. 6d.

The nineteenth Fernley Lecture is of less weight avoirdupois, but it has *wecht* of its own. Mr. Beet is a clear thinker, and he is well read in his subject. Selecting his topics with judgment, he goes over a wide ground, touching into light many points which can be touched upon and nothing more. From this as a good introduction one could pass very profitably to Ebrard.

II.

AGAINST ATHEISM AND AGNOSTICISM.

PUBLISHERS—The Clarendon Press, Oxford.
AUTHOR—James Martineau, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.
TITLE—A Study of Religion: its Sources and Contents. Second Edition revised. Crown 8vo, 2 vols., pp. xxx., 392, 400. 1889, 15s.

A Study of Religion—to which one turns with a sense of relief from the less savoury atmosphere of *The Seat of Authority*—is already a classic, and comes within our range only through this revised edition with its new Preface. Though Dr. Martineau himself hesitates to admit the book within the scope of that "uninviting word" Apologetics, its place is certainly here. The whole book is an effective apologetic for the "old belief" that God is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. Its largest division is entitled Theism, and to that subject there is no better introduction. The new Preface adds little new matter, but sets the old in a clearer perspective.

PUBLISHERS—Macmillan & Co.
AUTHOR—Francis Ellingwood Abbot, Ph.D.
TITLE—Scientific Theism. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, pp. xxiv., 219. 1886, 7s. 6d.

Agnosticism is understood to have been born of the scientific method. Professor Abbot works along the lines of that very method, and seeks to show that it is both a philosophical and a scientific absurdity. Phenomenism—the philosophy that would rest content with things seen—is impossible. For every phenomenon we are obliged to supply in thought an object beyond itself—a noumenon—as its ground. Science must take account of this noumenon also, and so is led irresistibly (if true to its own method) to the recognition of the universe as an infinite organism whose life-principle must be an infinite immanent personal Power. *Scientific Theism* is an able book, and will repay that patient study which its technical language and condensed argument demand.

PUBLISHERS—Macmillan & Co.
AUTHOR—Francis Ellingwood Abbot, Ph.D.
TITLE—The Way out of Agnosticism; or, The Philosophy of Free Religion. Crown 8vo, pp. xii., 83. 1890, 4s. 6d.

The Way out of Agnosticism deals with precisely the same subject as *Scientific Theism*. But it is mainly occupied with a vindication of that scientific method which is relied upon in securing that the science of the future be not agnostic. Those who read the earlier volume will read this also, and it is better to read the other first.

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.
AUTHOR—James Hutchison Stirling, LL.D.
TITLE—Philosophy and Theology: being the First Edinburgh Gifford Lectures. Post 8vo, pp. xvi., 408. 1890, 9s.

There are mutterings and something more that the Gifford Lectureship is not to prove an unmixed gain to Apologetics. But the first Edinburgh Lectures may be accepted without misgiving. Their greatest merit is perhaps not in this line. Literature and philosophy may make a prior claim. But even when Aristotle is being brilliantly expounded and Hume dissected, even amidst every interesting digression, it is steadily borne in mind that the purpose of the lectureship is apologetic. The first ten lectures are "positive." They trace in the history of philosophy the evidences which great thinkers have found of design in the universe. The rest are "negative." They criticise the writings and the writers who reject design. The line of research is fresh, and conducted with conspicuous ability. So that here we have a distinct new contribution to our subject, and a very pleasant path leads to its acquisition.

PUBLISHERS—The Religious Tract Society.
AUTHORS—Various.
TITLE—Present Day Tracts on the Christian Philosophies of the Age. Crown 8vo. 1888, 3s. 6d.

The Present Day Tracts of the Religious Tract Society deserve their success. We believe that hey have done more in recent years for the Apologetics of Christianity than any other book or books. Were there nothing else to keep alive the late secretary's memory, this series will do it. They may be had in three forms: singly at 4d., in volumes of six in the order of issue at 2s. 6d., and bound according to subject in special volumes of six at 2s. 6d., or eight at 3s. 6d. The last form is the best, and will be the most popular in the end. Here is one

of them on the *Non-Christian Philosophies of the Age*, and here are its contents: "Christianity and Secularism," by Professor Blaikie; "Agnosticism," by Dr. Noah Porter; "Modern Materialism," by the late W. F. Wilkinson; "Herbert Spencer's Philosophy," by Professor Iverach; "Modern Pessimism," by Professor Radford Thomson; "Utilitarianism," by the same; "Comte and the Religion of Humanity," by the same; and the "Ethics of Evolution," by Professor Iverach.

PUBLISHER—T. Fisher Unwin.
AUTHOR—T. E. S. T., an Old Life Member of the British Association.
TITLE—The Two Kinds of Truth; or, The Two Spheres of Truth. A Test of other Theories. 8vo, pp. xxiv., 380. Second Edition. 1890, 7s. 6d.

A book which discusses questions of science and philosophy, and is published anonymously, must have something distinctive about it to pass so early into a second edition. The subject is Evolution, especially in its religious bearings. The author is not antagonistic to the evolution theory in all its aspects. The evolution of species may possibly be found to be true, but the evolution of man from the lower animals he holds to be impossible. For man and the monkey belong to two different spheres, between which there is an impassable gulf. This is the secret of the book. There are two kinds of truth, or two spheres of existence, natural and universal, between which there is no correspondence. Instinct belongs to the one, mind to the other. By no possibility, therefore, can mind be evolved out of instinct, the man from the ape. The book is easy and pleasant to read, and it is enriched with many appropriate quotations and references, to which an excellent index gives ready access.

PUBLISHERS—James Nisbet & Co.
AUTHOR—Robert A. Watson, M.A.
TITLE—Gospels of Yesterday. Crown 8vo. Third Edition, pp. viii., 217. 1889, 5s.

The Gospels of yesterday are not, Mr. Watson thinks, the Gospels for to-day. The old is better. He criticises three: Professor Henry Drummond's Gospel of the Higher Biology, Herbert Spencer's Gospel of the Lower Biology, and Matthew Arnold's Gospel of Nature. The first essay should be read along with *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*—in place, say, of its own introduction—if there is any one left who has not yet read that fascinating book. The second essay is more elaborate, and serves as a guide to the intricacies (and the fallacies) of Mr. Spencer's Ethics. But the criticism of Matthew Arnold is most to our mind, in tone and effect quite admirable.

PUBLISHERS—The Religious Tract Society.
AUTHOR—Sir J. William Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S.
TITLE—Modern Ideas of Evolution as related to Religion and Science. Cr. 8vo, pp. 240. 1890, 5s.

Sir William Dawson's *Modern Ideas of Evolution* is probably the most effective popular criticism of Darwinism in its religious aspect which we have. But the book is more than a polemic. It may serve very well as an easy introduction to the *doctrine* of evolution. An admirable brief Appendix makes clear the points of "Weismann on Heredity."

PUBLISHERS—Chapman & Hall.
AUTHOR—Joseph Le Conte, Professor of Geology and Natural History in the University of California.
TITLE—Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought. Crown 8vo, pp. xviii., 344. 1888, 6s.

"Professor Joseph Le Conte," says Sir W. Dawson in the book just noticed, "is a geologist of some repute, and a clear thinker, who aims to combine the various schools of evolution, whether Darwinian or Lamarckian, and to reconcile the whole with theistic beliefs." The reference is to the volume before us, and that sentence correctly describes the main purpose and standpoint of this book. But its greatest value lies in its clear and full exposition of the theory of evolution itself. After Sir W. Dawson's own little book, one could not do better than study Le Conte. For, though it may rank behind Dr. Wallace's *Darwinism* as an exposition pure and simple, its steady reference to the religious aspect of the theory gives it a special position and importance.

PUBLISHERS—James Nisbet & Co.
AUTHOR—James M'Cosh, D.D., LL.D., Litt. D., Ex-President of Princeton College.
TITLE—The Religious Aspect of Evolution. Crown 8vo, Enlarged Edition, pp. 119. 1890, 5s.

Says Sir William Dawson again (for little escapes him):—"The venerable ex-President of Princeton has just issued a second edition of his little work, *The Development Hypothesis*, under a new name. It assumes that the various theories of evolution are all established scientific results, and then proceeds to show that they can be received up to a certain point without destroying our belief in God." But, in reality, Dr. M'Cosh neither accepts nor rejects evolution, and does not concern himself with its theories. The actual thesis of the work, as Sir William Dawson, rightly correcting himself, adds, is that the belief in secondary causes in creation is perfectly consistent with a belief in a Divine First Cause. And it is just here that clearness and conviction should be sought. Then we are ready fearlessly to examine any theory of development.

[CORRECTION.—In our January issue, under RECENT LITERATURE IN SERMONS, we regret an error in quoting price of *The Weekly Pulpit*, Vol. I. New Series, published by Mr. Elliot Stock. The correct price is 3s. 6d.—EDITOR E. T.]

The Vernacular of Palestine in the Time of our Lord, and the Remains of it in St. Mark.

By the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, B.D., Hertford College, Oxford.

In several places of the New Testament Semitic words are found, some of which are proper names of persons and places, while others, like *Corban* (Mark vii. 11), are terms in familiar use; and others, again, like *Talitha cumi* (Mark v. 41), are pregnant sayings, or, like *Maran atha* (1 Cor. xvi. 22), are semi-proverbial expressions. The great interest to us of these terms and sentences lies in *this*—that they are (if anything be in the New Testament) sounds actually uttered by the sacred speakers. Most of them are ascribed to the Saviour Himself; and while it may legitimately be held that the inspired evangelists have often recorded the substance rather than the *verba ipsissima* of the Master's teaching, it is hardly open to doubt that He said "Ephphatha" to the deaf man, or that He uttered the awful cry from the Cross in the very words which are put into His mouth.

The occurrence of Semitic *proper names* in the Greek Testament has no more weight in determining what was the vernacular of the apostles and evangelists, than the presence of non-Saxon proper names would have in an inquiry about the vernacular of England in the nineteenth century. Although a certain town was called by the Semitic name Καπερναούμ [כְּפַר נַחוּם (K'phar Nachum), *Nahum's Town*], the name does not prove that all the inhabitants were men of Semitic speech. A patronymic like Βαρθολομαῖος [בַּר תַּלְמַי = *Talmay's son*] might be borne by one whose family had for generations used Greek; just as Price [*Ap Rice*] or Jones [*John's son*] are often the names of men whose ancestors long ago severed connection with Wales and Welsh. In this respect mere names prove nothing. Further, it has been thought that even the non-Greek *words and sayings* attributed to speakers in the sacred writings are not evidence of their ordinary language, but occur, perchance, as playful expressions, perchance as solemn utterances, spoken for effect in the obsolete ancestral tongue. This view is held in deference to an opinion that Greek had so completely taken possession of the countries which had been subjected to the conquests of Alexander the Great, that it had altogether ejected the national dialects. In Palestine, therefore, it is supposed that all classes used Greek (debased and corrupted, no doubt) as a vernacular, while the knowledge of Hebrew was the possession of the few, or at most, that its use was confined to the synagogue and the schools.

In Acts i. 19 we are informed on good authority that the Semitic name lately given to a certain field was in the ἴδιος διάλεκτος of Jerusalem. Certainly the *onus probandi* lies on those who declare that the Jews of Palestine had adopted the alien speech of Greece as their own. It is improbable *à priori;* for the Jews were not traders, to whom the language of the Mediterranean littoral would be an advantage. It is inconsistent with the admitted distinction between the *Jews*, or Hebræi of Palestine (Acts vi. 1), and the *Hellenists*, who used the Septuagint version. It is opposed to the universal judgment of writers in different parts of the ancient Church. It is contradicted by the indirect evidence of facts of the Gospel story. Peter was recognised as a Galilean by his accent. There is evidence that the inhabitants of Northern Palestine pronounced their Semitic letters somewhat barbarously, but it is not known that a Galilean and a Jerusalemite would accent Greek differently. The threefold inscription on the Cross is inexplicable, if those who could not understand the official Latin could read the Hellenistic version without requiring a Hebrew interpretation. Again, the words of Josephus in *Antiq.* xx. 11 afford the clearest evidence that not Greek, but some form of *Hebrew*, was the language of the educated Jews; much less, therefore, is it likely that Greek was the language of the peasants and fishermen of Galilee, amongst whom our Lord dwelt and laboured, and from whom He chose His apostles. It must therefore be assumed, in spite of the warm advocacy of an opposite opinion, that the vernacular of Palestine was *Semitic* during the last century of the national existence.

As to the particular dialect of that vernacular, various opinions have been held. It is a widespread tradition in the Syriac Church that it corresponded with the idiom of their own national version of the Scriptures; but this is inconsistent with the few remains which are extant in the New Testament writings. It has often been tacitly assumed that the Jews changed the *Hebrew*, which they undoubtedly spoke before the captivity, for *Chaldee*, which they learned in Babylon. The Chaldee Targums are appealed to in proof of this; but a similar argument would compel the conclusion that all Jews spoke Greek, because there is a *Septuagint* extant. Besides, a large population never left the Holy Land. Again, the influence of the court of Babylon was not permanent, and under the Maccabean ascendency a variety of

circumstances tended towards a great revival of Hebrew customs, Hebrew worship, Hebrew culture and speech. The prevalence of Hebrew after the Captivity is demanded by the position assumed by radical critics, that the greater part of the Old Testament was composed, and certainly the whole revised, in the Maccabean days; while all will admit that the post-exilic prophets addressed their contemporaries in Hebrew and not in Aramaic.

This later Hebrew of the last of the prophets and their contemporaries formed the basis of the subsequent vernacular of Palestine. In Galilee it was specially exposed to deteriorating influences, and at last was perhaps little different from the Aramaic of neighbouring districts. In Jerusalem it was cultivated with a view to greater purity. The popular speech has been described[1] as a jargon of Hebrew words, Aramaic forms, Latin and Greek terms; and while this may be overstated, there can be no doubt that the vernacular was much corrupted, and, indeed, that several Semitic dialects prevailed, corresponding with the mixture of races in the population. It is perhaps hopeless now to attempt to recover their respective idioms. As a general term to connote their origin, inter-relation, and common features, *Aramaized Hebrew* would not be unsuitable. The root was the ancestral speech; but some of the branches were so much affected by their surroundings that they had almost lost their connection with the parent stem.

In the vernacular fragments preserved by St. Mark, the following points may be noticed:—

1. The prefix *bar*. It is true that this is an Aramaic word for *son;* but since it occurs in *Proverbs* (xxxi. 2), a work which, even on the most extravagant view of its compilation, is *Hebrew*, and not *Chaldee*, no inference as to the Palestinian dialect can fairly be drawn from its use.

2. Βοανεργές. *Boane* appears to be a corruption, perhaps north country pronunciation, of the *Hebrew* and *Aramaic* b'ney. The latter part of the epithet represents either רֶגֶשׁ (regesh), or רַעַשׁ (ra'ash), for the middle guttural ע might be represented by γ. Both words are Hebrew—the former meaning a *crowd*, the latter the *noise of a crowd*, and once (Ezek. iii. 12, 13) apparently *thunder;* but either would easily pass into the *βροντή* of the evangelist.

3. Ταλιθὰ κοῦμι. The second word is the imperative קוּמִי (qumi), *arise!* either Hebrew or Aramaic, the form being common to both. The first represents טְלִיתָא, an Aramaic form, talyâ, *a boy*, t'lîthâ, *a girl*.

4. Κορβάν is a transliteration of קָרְבָּן, which occurs several times in Leviticus and Numbers for an *offering*.

5. Ἐφφαθά represents the Hebrew הִפְתַּח (hippathach), the aspiration at the beginning being lost, and the final guttural resolved into a vowel sound, which constantly occurred — *e.g.* יִצְחָק (yitschak) becomes Ισαάκ, Isaac. The Aramaic for *Be opened!* transliterated into Greek would be *ἐθφαθθα*, or perhaps *ἐθπαττα* or *ἐθπεθα;* the initial syllable being *eth*, not *hip*, or *επ*, or *εφ*.

6. Ῥαββί and Ῥαββονί are transliterations of the Hebrew (and Aramaic) רַבִּי, and the Aramaic רִבּוֹנִי, respectively, the first vowel, *i*, of the latter being corrupted to *a*.

7. Πάσχα. The term is used in an Aramaic, and perhaps popular form, for the Hebrew is פֶּסַח, *pesach*.

8. Similarly Σατανᾶς represents the Aramaic סָטָנָא.

9. And Ἀββί is the Aramaic אַבָּא.

10. Ἐλωὶ Ἐλωὶ λεμὰ σαβαχθανεί. The last word is from the *Aramaic* verb שְׁבַק (sh'vaq), *forsake*. λεμά (of which there are other forms in the MSS.) may be either *Hebrew* למה or Aramaic לְמָא. Ἐλωί represents the Aramaic אֱלָהִי (Ĕlâhi), but, by a Galilean pronunciation, Ĕlauhi; and, as distinguished from the form in St. Matthew, expresses the very word employed by our Lord.

In Nos. (2), (10), we have evidence tending to the proof that the Peshitto is a translation of the Greek, and not an original Aramaic record; for at Mark iii. 17 it reads, "He surnamed them B'ney Regesh, that is, B'ney Ra'mo"—*ra'am* in Syriac (and Hebrew) meaning *thunder*. Again, at xv. 35 the '*μεθερμηνεύομενον*' was evidently before the Syrian, for his Peshitto has, "Il, Il, l'mono sh'vaqthoni; that is, Alohi, Alohi l'mono sh'vaqthoni." There seems to be here a reminiscence of St. Matthew, and perhaps a different reading from our current Greek; but that a Greek archetype underlies the text in both passages is indisputable.

To sum up. The vernacular of Palestine, which was employed by our Lord, was neither Chaldee nor Syriac, although adulterated by these dialects. Some fragments are preserved, especially by St. Mark, and the use made of them by the Syriac translator shows that he prepared his Peshitto by a version from the Greek, and not from independent traditions.

The subject may be studied further in *The Dialects spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ* (Neubauer); *Studia Biblica*, 1885; *Greek the Language of Christ and His Apostles* (Roberts), 1888.

[1] Immanuel Deutsch's *Literary Remains*, the Talmud, p. 42.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xiii. 12.

"Now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I have been known" (R.V.).

Exposition.

"*We see.*" The object is God Himself, with His plan of grace and glory toward us.—*Godet.*

"*In a mirror.*" It may be translated "by means of a mirror" (Wordsworth), but is more naturally taken as referring to the illusion under which what we see appears to be on the other side of the surface, and as it were through it.—*Ellicott.*

The mirror is everything that reveals God in the present state of existence, such as the visible creation (Rom. i. 20), and the life of Jesus Christ on earth, so far as it is unconnected with His glorified life in heaven (2 Cor. v. 16), and even the gospel itself.—*Edwards.*

"*Darkly,*" literally "*in the form of enigma.*" The word "enigma" denotes a sentence which, without expressly saying the thing, leaves it to be guessed. It thus serves to bring out the relative obscurity in the manifestation of divine things, which we now possess.—*Godet.*

The gospel is a revelation of God, but not a full revelation. It is indeed "in a mystery," but it is also in an enigma or riddle. To borrow Leibnitz' distinction, our knowledge of God in the present life is symbolical; but when Christ appears it will be intuitive. The reason is, that it will be an immediate knowledge of Christ Himself at His coming.—*Edwards.*

"*Then shall I know.*" The verb is here compounded with a preposition which makes it stronger than the simple form used in the previous clause —"fully know."—*Ellicott.*

"*I have been known.*" Again, the compound verb, adding intensity. But what is the time referred to? The tense is the aorist or simple past, "I was known;" and Meyer and Kling [and Ellicott] think it refers to the date of conversion. [As I was known by God at the time that His saving knowledge was directed to me, and I was called and converted.—*Ellicott.*] But this restricted sense is unnatural in our passage. Paul was speaking of the knowledge which God has of man during the whole course of his life. From the standpoint of the life to come, at which the context puts us, this knowledge appears to him as a thing of the past.—*Godet.*

St. Paul, like one acquainted with divine transitions, swiftly takes his stand upon a height in the future beyond the Parousia, from which he looks back upon his speck of earth-life, the scene of his conversion, and ecstasies, and visions, and prophesyings, and preachings, and sufferings, in all of which he was in communion with God, and thoroughly known of Him.—*Evans.*

Exegetical Note.

ἐπιγινώσκειν. In the language of St. Paul, ἐπίγνωσις denotes the advanced or perfect knowledge, which is the ideal state of the true Christian. It appears only in his Latin epistles (from Romans onwards), where the more contemplative aspects of the gospel are brought into view, and its comprehensive and eternal relations more fully set forth. But the power of the preposition appears in the verb, no less than in the substantive. In this passage it is forced upon our notice. The partial knowledge (γινώσκειν ἐκ μέρους) is contrasted with the full knowledge (ἐπιγινώσκειν) which shall be attained hereafter. This distinction is missed in the authorised version here, though it is observed in 2 Cor. vi. 9, "as unknown, and yet *well known.*" (ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι). *Lightfoot:* A Fresh Revision. See also Lightfoot's *Colossians*, p. 138; and Delitzsch's *Hebrews*, x. 26.

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Present Knowledge and Future.

By the Very Rev. C. J. Vaughan, D.D.

1. *The imperfection of our present knowledge of divine things.* It is said to be twofold, an imperfection of *kind* and an imperfection of *degree.* (1) The first is illustrated by two comparisons. (*a*) We see by means of a mirror; that is to say, it is a *reflection* of truth we have at present, not the very truth itself. The copy is both defective and misleading. How often is the face of the mirror occupied with other images! How often is the vision distorted by passion or guilty remembrance! (*b*) We see darkly, or, more correctly, in a riddle, enigma, or dark saying. Our knowledge comes to us through words, the source of so much misunderstanding and confusion. We apply a human language to measure divine things. What is infinity, eternity? Each a riddle. (2) But our present knowledge is also imperfect in *degree.* "I know in part." Our great difficulty in religion is to know how to combine. We have several portions of divine truth communicated to us, but in many cases without the connecting

link—God's justice and mercy: His hatred of sin, and permission of the existence of evil: man's free will and God's free grace. But we know that God sees them in one. And "what I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter."

2. *The future perfection of our knowledge.* Here also we have two illustrations. (1) "But then face to face." Our knowledge of truth will be *direct;* not by reflection, but by intuition. And it will be *personal.* Face to face implies a person: "The glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." (2) "Even as I was known." Therefore our knowledge will be *thorough;* through and through. God is a heart-searching God. And it will be *comprehensive.* God's insight is large as well as minute. Notwithstanding a fault, He sees a servant; notwithstanding a good quality, He sees an enemy. Seeing minutest qualities, He judges of the character as a whole. We also shall see God's truth in its reconciling harmony and perfect unity.

The imperfection of our present knowledge of divine things must make no one idle in the pursuit of it. In this also, "Whosoever hath, to him shall be given."

Finally, though many of our theologies may be contradicted, nothing that we have known of the living Saviour Himself will be contradicted, nothing that we have learned of Him by experience, or seen of Him in prayer.

II.

The Knowledge of God.

By the Rev. Phillips Brooks.

What Paul prophesies for man, Christ already possesses. Paul says, "Some day I shall know God as God knows me." Jesus says, "As God knows me, even so I do now know God." This is man's highest hope. It has been realised already in the man Christ Jesus. Thus we know that our hope is not a vain hope.

1. "God knows me," says St. Paul. That was his fundamental conviction. But that conviction involved another. If the Father knew the child, it must be in the child's power to know the Father. Paul was no agnostic. Known perfectly, he knew but in part; but the time would come when he should know as he was known. And this certainty of a future knowledge was itself a present knowledge.

2. This future knowledge means perfect obedience in the future: perfect harmony between the child's action and the Father's will. When Jesus said, "The Father knoweth me," He meant, "God has a will for every act of mine." And when He said, "I know the Father," He meant, "In every act of mine I do the Father's will." So with us. With perfect freedom answering to every will of God. There alone is peace and power.

III.

The Enigma of Life.

By the Rev. Professor E. Johnson, M.A.

1. We here look through a mirror on an enigma. What is an enigma? It is a form of thought and speech which half reveals and half conceals the soul of truth. Every proverb gives only one face of the truth, and leaves you to find the other faces. Hence almost every such saying may be capped or countered by some other saying which expresses the exact opposite. Such proverbs or parables are nature and human life to us. The seed-corn, the lily, the little birds, are enough to keep us ever translating, interpreting, and setting to music.

> "Flower in the crannied wall,
> I pluck you out of the crannies,
> Hold you here in my hand.
> Little flower; but if I could understand,
> And say what you are, and all in all,
> I could tell what God and man is."

All nature is a sacramental symbol of the Divine. And what an enigma is human life! In poem or story it is a subject ever new. The human soul is the enigma of enigmas. It is the meeting-point of heaven and hell. It reflects the serenity of the smiling sky, and all the blackness and horror of storms.

2. What is the temper of mind that befits us in presence of this enigma? Evidently a lowly habit, the opposite of conceit and dogmatism. Truth is found in every sect, yet will tarry long in no sect. Consider that your antipathies help you as much as your sympathies, he who makes a fault repulsive does you the same service as he who makes a grace attractive. We are here to learn rather than to teach—

> "Only a learner, quick one or slow one,
> Just a discerner, I would teach no one."

And thus, through lowliness, we may reach patience and leisure of mind.

3. Love is the last solution of the enigma of life. The cause of any serious infidelity that exists lies here, that men doubt whether God is as loving as themselves. But whence came that yearning compassion in us? A law of our being? "God is Law, say the wise." But the pain, the mystery of life? A love that hurts, a love that works through pain instead of pleasure is hard to understand and receive. But Christ showed love working beneath a mask of pain and self-denial, and positively rejecting immediate enjoyment. And Christ's disciple comes to acknowledge that the best proof of God's love has been found in the trials and darkness of life.

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

PERHAPS there was floating before the mind of the Apostle that passage in Num. xii. 8, where the Lord says of Moses: "With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches (δι' αἰνιγμάτων—LXX.), and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold."—*Kling.*

AN enigma (in English, *riddle*) is properly a question such as the Sphinx propounded to Œdipus, couched in obscure language, the answer to which it is difficult to find. Cf. Num. xii. 8, and Prov. i. 6, where the Hebrew word is translated in the Septuagint by the word used here by St. Paul. Also Tennyson's *Miller's Daughter*—

> "There's something in this world amiss
> Shall be *unriddled* by and by."—*Lias.*

IT is owing to the dark places in our hearts that we find so many places in the Bible dark.—*A. Tholuck.*

THERE is a deep undertone of sadness in Shakespeare, as if the problems of life had been too hard for him. A similar melancholy may be detected in a great many of the poets and writers of this century. Age brings sadness. Browning has not so noticeably lost the dew of his youth; but Carlyle and Ruskin show in their later writings the grey hairs of a world-sorrow here and there upon them. Is this inevitable? Must great souls go sadly till—

> "Death with the might of his sunbeam
> Touches the flesh, and the soul awakes?"

It cannot be wondered at that this should seem an unintelligible world" if we turn our faces away from the light of Christ.—*A. Craig.*

IT were to be wished that that active penetration and close and acute attention which mankind have applied to so many subjects of knowledge, and so successfully, had been applied, in somewhat greater proportion than it has been, to the due apprehension of that very important article of knowledge, their own ignorance.—*J. B. Mozley; Predestination.*

IF the Bible speaks of a disadvantageous "now," it is always able to put over against it a bright and glorious "then."—*H. Wonnacott.*

PAUL'S is a better philosophy of life than that of the grammarian of the Middle Ages, who is represented by Browning as living only to learn, and hoping to begin to *do* something in the other life. Paul spends his life in doing, and hopes to begin knowing in the future.—*A. Craig.*

THOUGH the Christian only sees the truth at first in the reflection of a mirror, and in many ways veiled, yet in principle he has notwithstanding the entire truth, since the perception of the glory of Christ, as the very image of God, is lighted up in him, and this light is reflected upon him with "open face," so that he is changed more and more into the same image.—*Pfleiderer; Paulinism*, i. 209.

MY WEB OF LIFE.

No chance has brought this ill to me:
'Tis God's sweet will, so let it be:
He seeth what I cannot see.

There is a need-be for each pain,
And He will make it one day plain
That earthly loss is heavenly gain;

Like as a piece of tapestry,
Viewed from the back appears to be
Nought but threads tangled hopelessly;

But in the front a picture fair
Rewards the worker for his care,
Proving his skill and patience rare.

Thou art the workman, I the frame:
Lord, for the glory of Thy name,
Perfect Thine image on the same.

Requests and Replies.

At Brodick last month it was my good fortune to fall in with a Jewish Rabbi, an intelligent and most friendly man. One Sabbath morning he accompanied us to service in the Free Church, where the first psalm of praise given out was the 84th, and I was glad to see him join heartily in the singing of it. I took the liberty afterwards of telling him that the third verse had long been a difficulty to me, as I could not fancy the swallow choosing a place of such constant traffic as the altar in which to nestle. His answer was—that both our old and our new translations failed to give us a fair idea of the original Hebrew. Is this so?—A. B.

This passage cannot be taken literally. Only one altar is possible for the birds mentioned in the verse—viz. the altar for sacrifices, which stood before the holy place. The incense altar within the holy place is out of the question. But it would be scarcely less reasonable to suppose that swallows or sparrows found a place for their nests on or about the brazen altar, and hatched their young under the eyes and the fostering care of the priests, who used that altar for the daily sacrifice, morning and evening, and for the multitude of other sacrifices which crowded the Jewish calendar. A piece

of furniture so sacred as the brazen altar was not likely to be left as a breeding-place for sparrows.

The verse may be explained in more than one way. Taking the rendering in the Revised Version it is divided at the word *young* by the strongest disjunctive accent in Hebrew poetry. If the latter half of the verse is intended to define the place where these little birds build their nest, the altars may be taken as practically equivalent to the courts of the previous verse, or to the tabernacles of verse first; that is to say, the altars are important enough, in the view of the Psalmist, to be used in this poetic passage as a designation for the sanctuary as a whole. (Compare the popular use, from many a pulpit in our own day, of the expression "the courts of God's House.")

Or the preposition in the phrase "even thine altars" may be taken in the sense of near-ly close-ly, a signification which it has elsewhere. The meaning would then be,—the nests of these sparrows, etc., are built in sheltered nooks in the temple-walls,—near by the altar or altars. This is in accordance with fact; at least, if travellers may be trusted, sparrows have as little respect for a temple in the East, as for a dwelling-house of humble folk in the West.

There is, however, another line of exposition which some may prefer to follow. The reference to the little birds may be confined to the first half of the verse. In the second half, the Psalmist returns to the main theme of the first part of the psalm—viz. the blessedness of those who dwell with God, and enjoy friendly fellowship with Him. The reference to the birds has been introduced simply as an illustration, in order to facilitate the expression of the feelings of which the Psalmist's heart is full. As the little birds find a suitable place for their nests, and under the protecting care of their Creator rest in safety, and discharge the functions for which they have been made,—so does the Psalmist find rest for his soul and his true life at the altars of his God, with their sweet assurance of forgiveness, and reconciliation, and acceptance.

This last explanation is not so obvious as the others, but it may be vindicated. Any of the views suggested gets rid of the difficulty raised in the question.—G. G. CAMERON.

How do modern scholars understand the use of the plural in Gen. i. 26,—"Let *us* make man"?—R. S. T.

Gen. i. 26,—"Let us make man." What is the explanation of the first person plural?

(*a*) Compare the parallels presented in Gen. iii. 22, "as one of us;" xi. 7, "let us go down;" Isa. vi. 8, "Who will go for us."

(*b*) It would be a mistake to regard it as merely an instance of the careless use of the plural for the singular not infrequently adopted in conversational language. In the context there is nothing that would favour such an explanation (*cf.* ver. 29).

(*c*) It must not be explained as containing any reference to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. This has been a common view in the Church. But it is really indefensible. The doctrine of the Trinity belongs to the revelation of the New Covenant. There are not wanting signs in the Old Testament Scriptures which denote the steps preparatory to that doctrine. But the introduction of specifically New Testament teaching into Old Testament exegesis is productive of much mental confusion, and tends to obscure the gradual process of development through which the teaching of Revelation leads up to the glory of the Incarnation. However tempting it may be to assume such a doctrinal anachronism for homiletic purposes the principles of a sound exegesis are wholly against this view.

(*d*) Some regard it as the plural of majesty (*cf.* Ezra iv. 18). But somehow the idea of attributing the phraseology of an Oriental king to the utterance of the Almighty, in this chapter, does not carry probability with it.

(*e*) It is a possible explanation that God is represented as addressing Himself to the heavenly beings, the angels, "the sons of God" (*cf.* Job xxxviii. 7), by whom, according to Israelite belief, the heavenly throne was environed. In the last and crowning work of creation the Almighty speaks, as it were, to the blessed beings in whose spiritual existence man should be privileged to share. That He should seem to identify Himself with created spirits is an objection to this interpretation; but both here and in iii. 22 and xi. 7 such language is not out of harmony with the pictorial style of the narrative. The student will do well to refer to Ps. viii. 5, where the name Elohim is by some rendered "God" and by others "the angels." Compare also the mention of "the sons of God" in Job i. 6, ii. 1; Gen. vi. 2, 4.

(*f*) Lastly, the explanation should be mentioned that the plural pronoun corresponds in thought to the plural substantive "Elohim." The plural noun "Elohim" is explained by some to denote the variety and manifold energy of Divine power; and the plural is compared with the words "mayyim" = water and "shamayyim" = heaven. By others it is explained as a relic of the vocabulary of the polytheism, which the Israelites shared with other Semitic races (*cf.* Jos. xxiv. 2) before they obeyed the call to serve the living God. It does not, however, appear probable that the plural of manifold energy in the substantive should affect the use of the pronoun; while the suggestion that the plural is here an accidental survival of the old polytheistic form of the primeval tradition, or the exact

reproduction of some kindred (*e.g.* Babylonian) legend, is too hypothetical to be adopted.

The difficulty remains unsolved; but the supposition (*e*) that the Almighty is represented as addressing the inhabitants of heaven is the one which, in our present state of knowledge, seems to be the most probable.

HERBERT E. RYLE.

Ps. xxix. 6. Why do the LXX. call Hermon "the beloved?"—R. Balgarnie.

Perhaps the best answer to Dr. Balgarnie's query is that found in Bythner's *Lyre of David.* "The Sidonians call Hermon, *Sirion.* LXX. by metathesis יְשָׂרוֹן *beloved.*"—J. SMITH.

Will you recommend a cheap magazine or weekly paper for the teacher to prepare for the International Lesson?—G. D.

There are many monthly magazines which might be named, but two of sterling worth have come constantly under our notice for some time—*The Church Sunday School Magazine* and *The Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School Magazine.* The latter devotes itself almost entirely to the Sunday School Lessons, and costs only 2d.; the former contains other articles of interest to teachers, and costs 4d. Of weekly papers there is a still greater variety. Very cheap and full of point is the *Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School Record* (½d.). Perhaps the most useful is the *Sunday School Chronicle* (1d.), but it cannot even approach the (American) *Sunday School Times* for wealth of exposition and illustration.—THE EDITOR.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

NEW DEPARTURE.

HAVING chosen for systematic study—

GENESIS in the Old Testament (the early chapters), and
EPHESIANS in the New Testament,

We invite our readers—so many of them as discover the need and the opportunity—to study with us either of these Books or both of them. In the issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1891, two sets of examination papers will be published upon each of these books, four sets in all.

1. The first set of questions will take Dr. Dods' *Commentary on Genesis* as basis (Clark's *Handbooks for Bible Classes*, 2s. 6d.) up to page 27, *together with such papers upon the early chapters of Genesis as appear in* THE EXPOSITORY TIMES *from the December issue* (see Dr. Lumby's introductory paper) *to the issue for May.* No knowledge of Hebrew will be expected.

2. The second set of questions will take Delitzsch's *New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i. (T. & T. Clark, 10s. 6d.) as basis, to the end of p. 204, including the Introduction, and such papers as appear in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, as stated above. An elementary knowledge of Hebrew will be counted upon.

3. The third set of questions will take Moule's *Commentary on Ephesians* (*Cambridge Bible for Colleges*, 2s. 6d.) or Agar Beet's *Ephesians* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1890, 7s. 6d.), including the Introductions and Appendices, together with such papers as appear on Ephesians in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from December to May. No knowledge of Greek will be expected.

4. The fourth set of questions will take as basis either Meyer's *Commentary on Ephesians*, with Introduction and Notes, or the same portion of Ellicott's *Commentary* (Longmans). Some knowledge of Greek will be expected.

Any person may take Nos. 1 and 3, or 2 and 4, but not Nos. 1 and 2, or 3 and 4. The questions may be answered with the free use of these books and papers, or with the assistance of any other books at command. But it will be impossible to answer them well without careful *study* of the portions named.

For the best papers the Publishers will offer books of value, as formerly, those to Nos. 2 and 4 being of more value and of a higher class than those to Nos. 1 and 3.

But, in addition to these, we have proposals to make for more immediate practical work.

Books will be offered *every month*—

1. To the Ministers and Members of some particular Church only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or an Address on any passage occurring in Genesis i.–xi.

2. To all and sundry, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Accordingly, we offer books this month—

1. To the Ministers and Members of the Congregational Churches only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or Address on any passage in Genesis (Chapters i.–xi.). The Notes must not occupy more than half a column of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, this type. They should be after the nature of the "Methods of Treatment" in the *Great Text Commentary, i.e.* readable in themselves.

2. To all, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians. No restriction as to length or manner of treatment will be made at present. The original Greek may be referred to or not as convenient.

The best papers will be published every month in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES; and when the writers see them there they may send to the Publishers for the book they select, out of a list which will be given. The number and value of the books will depend upon the success of this scheme of work. The writer's name and address should be given, but no names or initials will be published except of those whose papers are printed, and who do not express a desire to the contrary. The papers intended for April must be received by the Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B., by the 10th day of March, and so on for every succeeding month.

Those whose papers are found in this issue will kindly let the Publishers know which of the following books they wish sent to them:—

Delitzsch's *Iris: Studies in Colour and Talks about Flowers.*
The Voice from the Cross (Ahlfeld, etc.).
Ewald's *Syntax of the Hebrew Language.*
Beck's *Pastoral Theology.*
Monrad's *The World of Prayer.*
Rothe's *Sermons for the Christian Year.*

Note on the Phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.

Ephesians i. 3, 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12. The phrase is peculiar to the epistle, though the adj. ἐπουράνιος occurs elsewhere in New Testament, and we have τὰ ἐπουράνια in John iii. 12; Heb. ix. 23.

The Revised Version renders consistently throughout "in the heavenly *places*." But the use of the word "places" (A. V. also) involves a measure of difficulty. Our notions of place in such a connection are necessarily vague, and almost inevitably carry with them a sense of aloofness which interferes with harmonious interpretation in the passages cited.

(Note also, τὰ ἐπουράνια in John iii. 12, etc., could not possibly mean "the heavenly places" any more than the antithetic τὰ ἐπίγεια means "the earthly places.")

Without calling in question the usefulness of such terms as "heaven" and "above" in their common acceptation, in the present case it seems desirable to interpret ἐν τ. ἐπουρ. as having special reference to *conditions* of life and being. Some such phrase as "in the heavenly sphere" would indicate my line of interpretation (cf. "in the spiritual world.")

In Christ, our life is lifted into new relations. It has a far higher and wider range than the sphere of τὰ ἐπίγεια (Phil. iii. 19). We have heaven and eternal life now as well as to come. Bishop Lightfoot's note on Col. iii. 1 is helpful here. The change experienced by one who is quickened (Eph. ii. 1) and raised with Christ "is nothing less than a removal into a new sphere of being. He is translated from earth to heaven." Cf. also the contrast between the "spiritual" and the "natural" man in 1 Cor. ii. In life on the spiritual side, moreover, men are so conditioned as to be in contact with beings who are altogether free from the limitations of earthly existence.

Briefly referring to the passages where the phrase occurs, observe:—

1. In i. 3 and ii. 6, St. Paul is plainly speaking of an actual experience, of blessings enjoyed here and now in Christ. In i. 3 the term "spiritual" (πνευματικῇ) is itself in a measure explanatory of ἐν τ. ἐπουρ., as marking in what respect the blessing is experienced. In the same way, we "sit" (involving settled fellowship) with Christ, ἐν τ. ἐπουρ. But give prominence to the idea of *place*, and a good deal of exegetical twisting has to be done in interpreting the passages. (See, *e.g.*, Alford's notes *in loc.*)

2. So again in i. 20, of which we have an echo in ii. 6. With the stress on "places," especially when taken along with "far above," etc., what a sense we get of almost impassable distance! Let us see, however, that in a real sense and to a certain extent believers themselves are already ἐν τ. ἐπουρ., and this vanishes. ὑπεράνω κ.τ.λ. may be taken as indicating degree of exaltation in dignity and power.

3. Take iii. 10 and vi. 12 together. Here we see how curiously the dominating thought of *place* has influenced the translation in the Authorised Version. In vi. 12 it gives us "*high places*" instead of "*heavenly places*" as in iii. 10 and the other passages, whilst "heavenly" is timidly set down in the margin. The difficulty evidently was, could good and evil spirits be both in the same place, be alike ἐν τ. ἐπουρ.? But the phrase here hardly indicates more than that good and evil spirits ("principalities," etc.,) live in similar conditions as regards existence, just as good and bad men live in similar conditions as far as life in this world is concerned. This does not alter the fact of great difference (and so distance) between them in point of personal qualities and experience. In both passages here, free communication with mankind is implied on the part of spiritual powers. In vi. 12, whether we take ἐν. τ. ἐπ. with ἡ πάλη, or with τὰ πνευματικὰ κ.τ.λ., an absurdity is involved unless we are in some sense ἐν τ. ἐπουρ. ourselves.

JOHN S. CLEMENS.

Genesis iii. 9: Where art thou?

We have here God's first inquiry to man. It is the earliest call to reflection of which we have any account. It was asked not for information, but to stir the conscience of Adam.

It is the primary question addressed to every man, and is of the deepest practical interest.

1. Suggests. Every one is *somewhere*. Existence implies moral significance. Each has, for good or evil, a certain position, and is exerting a certain influence. You cannot be of no account, you must be reckoned. You cannot annihilate or even hide yourself morally. In thought, feeling, and purpose you must stand somewhere.

2. The question implies that God is *interested* in and takes *cognisance* of every man's whereabouts. We cannot escape God's eye. Adam thought he could. The question recalled him to a sense of his responsibility. Wherever we are, we are God's stewards, and are answerable to Him. The position we occupy is no matter of indifference. We cannot be anywhere (do anything or think as we please) with impunity.

3. There is a *right place* where God would have each man be. God has a purpose and a place for every one. There is great diversity of gift and task. But only as we stand right with God, and in harmony with His purposes, can we fill our proper place in the world. How with thee?

4. The question reminds us that many are *not where they should be.* Adam was not; and it was to bring him to a sense of his false position that God addressed him. Where art *thou?* What a condemnation this word contains for some to-day! Thou, with thy splendid abilities and opportunities, wasting thy gifts and idling thy time! Thou, a professing Christian, in the haunt of vice! Where art thou when truth demands a champion, and the Christian cause a witness? Among the deserters and the craven, hiding like Elijah under some juniper tree. Immersed in business or pleasure when God needs thee.

5. The question implies that many *are indifferent* as to where they are. They live in self. They estimate their position by their outward status. Not to "get on" in the world and make money is to be *nowhere*—a cypher. How different the view of life which Christ gives! To be about His Father's business, to be among men as one who served, that was to be in His true sphere. The question is not where are we in the world's estimation, but in God's sight.

Once more. The question is not where *have I been,* but where *am* I *now?* Past beliefs and bygone achievements cannot make up for present deficiencies. How do you stand towards God to-day? What think ye of Christ now? Are you for or against? If against, how all important to come into a proper relation. Christ is the reconciler. The possibility of reconciliation will soon be past. Where we are now decides where we shall be. Our here makes our hereafter. Where then art *thou?*

ARCH. B. D. ALEXANDER.

The Religious Literature of the Month.

BOOKS.

Talks with Men, Women, and Children.

MESSRS. ALEXANDER & SHEPHEARD have published the second series of *Talks with Men, Women, and Children,* by the Rev. David Davies, minister of Holland Road Baptist Church, Hove, Brighton (crown 8vo, 448 pp., 6s. 6d.). The men and women go together, but the children are separate, and to them the talk consists of a series of very lively expositions of the *Pilgrim's Progress.* In truth we like the children's portion so well that we are almost disappointed with the table that is spread for their elders. But it is the fault of the printer. What must have been telling and true in the living delivery looks somewhat partial and thin in the stately printed page. It certainly is a well-printed page, and a beautifully bound book, sure to be picked out when one is looking for a gift to give.

An Index to Schürer.

"A vigorous modern critic declares that a book without an index is as ugly and unsightly as a tailless ape." So we read in the *Christian Leader,* and heartily acquiesce. A book without this, its proper attachment, comes into the reader's hands with a suspicion attached to it instead. Says the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A., who translates the *Index to Schürer's History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ,* published by MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK (8vo, 100 pp., 2s. 6d. *nett*): "In accordance with the strongly expressed wish of Professor Schürer, his elaborate and carefully compiled Index has been faithfully reproduced in English for the benefit of students of his History." The Index includes—(*a*) Scripture passages; (*b*) Hebrew words; (*c*) Greek words; (*d*) Names and subjects; and some pages of additions and corrections to Division II. If we were asked to name the very best gift for a preacher, we should unhesitatingly say Schürer—with the Index.

The Lord's Supper.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK have also issued *The Lord's Supper: A Biblical Exposition of its Origin, Nature, and Use,* by the Rev. J. P. Lilley, M.A., sometime Hamilton Scholar and Cunningham Fellow of the New College, Edinburgh (crown 8vo, 330 pp., 5s.). Whoever remembers Mr. Lilley's clear and complete Reply to a recent Request in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES on the Literature of the Lord's Supper, will judge that by reading he is well equipped for this task. He is also an independent thinker, and can put his thoughts into good straightforward English. Above all, he is in warm, earnest sympathy with his great theme. Such a manual as this *was* needed.

Æsthetic Worship.

MR. R. D. DICKINSON has published a Paper originally read at a meeting of "Clergy in Council," by the Rev. Ralph Williams, Vicar of St. Luke's, Kilburn, under the title: *How far is it right to yield to the Æsthetic Taste of the Day in the Public Worship of the Church?* (crown 8vo, 56 pp.). It is a candid and well-informed attempt to lay down "the fair and reasonable limits of Church Ritual." It certainly deserves to be read.

The Expositor's Bible.

ST. JAMES AND ST. JUDE.

MESSRS. HODDER & STOUGHTON have this month sent out the second volume of the fourth year's series of the Expositor's Bible,—*The General Epistles of St. James and St. Jude,* by the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham (crown 8vo, x., 476 pp., 7s. 6d.). Dr. Plummer's hand is well in as an expositor, and his manner is well known. His *Gospel of St. John* in the Cambridge Bible has been a familiar and valued friend for some years. We are also getting acquainted with his *Pastoral Epistles* in this series. The present exposition

we have read carefully, and in some places tested its exegesis —with all the resources at our command—in particular upon the great crux of St. James' Epistle (iv. 5, 6), "one of the most difficult passages in the whole of the New Testament," as Dr. Plummer rightly says; and our belief is that it is the most trustworthy and practically useful commentary on these two epistles at present available.

Elijah.

The Editor of the *Preachers' Magazine* announces a series of small volumes under the title of "Books for all Bible Readers." The first is just issued—*Elijah, the Man of God*, by Mark Guy Pearse (C. H. Kelly, 1891, pp. 111, 1s.). It is a little book, but it will take its place beside the best monographs on Elijah. Krummacher may be more eloquent, and Taylor more theological, but Pearse is the most human and tender in his touch. The well-worn narrative of Elijah's life is brought very close to our common life.

The Spirit of Discipline.

Messrs. Longmans, Green, & Co. have issued another volume of Sermons by Canon Paget under the title of *The Spirit of Discipline* (crown 8vo, xii., 318 pp., 6s. 6d.). The title of the work, says Dr. Paget, "is meant to point towards a thought which, under various aspects, enters into most of the sermons here printed: the thought of the power which the grace of God confers on men to extend or strengthen, by dutiful self-discipline, the empire of the will. The reality of some such power is plainly suggested by the contrast between those lives in which more things seem possible year by year, and those in which more things continually seem impossible or intolerable; while, if there be such a power within reach, clearly a man's happiness and usefulness depend to a great extent on his seeking and exercising it. An especial task in which it may be exercised is described in the introductory essay which precedes the Sermons."

To follow one leading thought through a number of sermons is to run some risk, the risk of being one-sided in the choice of subject, or unnatural in its treatment. But Canon Paget is saved by the breadth and great human interest of his thought. Then there is the evidence of much careful reading; and, above all, of manly sense and earnestness in the whole handling and finish of the book. The introductory essay is curious and interesting. It concerns "Accidie," that *tristitia de bono divino*, that sorrowful despondency or listlessness concerning the good things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. It is a cloistered vice with many an uncloistered victim.

The Old Testament.

Messrs. Longmans have also issued this month *The Oracles of God; Nine Lectures on the Nature and Extent of Biblical Inspiration, and on the Special Significance of the Old Testament Scriptures at the Present Time*, by W. Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Oxford (crown 8vo, x., 147 pp., 4s.). We have dealt with this book in another place, and shall only add here that it deserves all the attention which its timeliness and its author's reputation are likely to bring it.

The Biblical Illustrator.

GENESIS AND ST. JOHN.

Messrs. James Nisbet & Co. have issued two more volumes of Mr. Exell's Biblical Illustrator. The one completes *Genesis* (8vo, 605 pp., 7s. 6d.), and the other commences *St. John's Gospel* (8vo, 674 pp., 7s. 6d.). Where else can you get as much homiletical material within the space or for the money?

Dr. Grosart's Hymns.

The Rev. Dr. A. B. Grosart of Blackburn has issued a series of hymns under the title of *Leaflets on Lights and Shadows of Christian Experience*, copies of which may be had from the author at 1d. each, or 50 for 1s. 3d., the set of 153 costing 3s. 6d., postage free. We choose the last for illustration of the series:—

"Lean Hard."

"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed [leans hard] on Thee; because he trusteth in Thee" (Isaiah xxvi. 3, and cf. l. 10).

1. Come thou to Me, afflicted one;
   Think not that thou art left alone;
   "I know thee," and keep watch and ward;
   Lean thou on Me, My child, *lean hard.*

2. Thy days are long—long, too, thy nights,
   By pain that stings—by fear that blights;
   See this—like daisies on the sward,—
   Lean thou on Me, My child, *lean hard.*

3. Be to thy cross now reconciled,
   Nor of thy trust be thou beguiled;
   All trial has its rich reward;
   Lean thou on Me, My child, LEAN HARD.

4. Doth darkness gather round thy path?
   Doth e'en Hope whisper "child of wrath"?
   From all the tempter's darts I'll guard;
   Lean thou on Me, My child, LEAN HARD.

5. Is Faith sore shaken or Love chilled?
   Thy heart with mystery of things filled?
   Does thy erst open way seem barred?
   Lean thou on Me, My child, LEAN HARD.

6. Weary and tossing, lift thine eyes
   Up to the hills where thy strength lies;
   Let nought thy coming steps retard;
   Lean thou on Me, My child, *lean hard.*

Justifying Righteousness.

Messrs. Seeley & Co. send a reissue of Principal Moule's little book, *Justifying Righteousness: a Consideration of some Questions concerning the Acceptance of the Believer before God* (62 pp., 4d.). This is a paper edition; surely there is one in cloth; for it is very greatly needed just at present, and ought to lie beside us always, since it is a truly scriptural and altogether admirable exposition of "the great revealed paradox" of the gospel.

Shall All be Made Alive?

The Rev. R. W. Harden, B.A., whose exegetical paper on Phil. iv. 5, "The Lord is at hand," was noticed by us when it appeared in the *Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review*, has published that able article in an attractive pamphlet (Dublin: George Herbert, 3d). Through the same publisher he has also issued an exegesis of 1 Cor. xv. 22, under the title, *Shall All be Made Alive? A Question of the Wider Hope* (4d). We shall endeavour to touch upon it when we come to that "Great Text" itself. Meantime it may be heartily recommended as a scholarly, impartial, and very full exegesis and exposition of one of the most trying passages in all Scripture.

Dr. Andrews' Life of Our Lord.

The New York Evangelist announces that a new edition of Dr. S. J. Andrews' well-known *Life of Our Lord upon the Earth*, rewritten and brought down to date in every particular, is in the press.

The Stirling Tract Enterprise.

The story of this "Enterprise," which is long since an accomplishment, is told in a little book just issued. But we prefer the tale as its three heartily evangelical magazines reveal it every month—*The British Messenger*, *Good News*, and *The Gospel Trumpet*. The first costs one penny, the others a halfpenny each.

MAGAZINES.

The Critical Review, No. II., has come in just as we go to press, and we can do no more than simply name its Contents:—*Books on Cardinal Newman*, by Principal Fairbairn, D.D.; Hume Brown's *George Buchanan*, by Prof. Roberts, D.D.; Jensen's *Kosmologie der Babylonier*, and Strassmaier's *Astronomisches aus Babylon*, by Prof. Sayce, D.D.; Baumstark's *Christenthum, etc.*, by Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D.; Frazer's *Golden Bough*, by Prof. Macalister, M.D.; Cave's *Doctrine of Sacrifice*, by Prof. Marcus Dods, D.D.; Salmon's *Historical Introduction*, by Rev. J. A. Cross, M.A.; Carpenter's *First Three Gospels*, by Prof. Iverach, D.D.; Schürer's *Jewish People*, by Vernon Bartlet, M.A.; Smith's *Isaiah*, by Prof. H. E. Ryle, M.A.; Dr. Matheson's *New Books*, by Rev. A. R. MacEwen, M.A.; Gretillat's *Théologie Systématique*, by Principal Cave, D.D.; Mead's *Supernatural Religion*, by Principal Simon, D.D.; Hutchison Stirling's *Philosophy and Theology*, by Prof. Stewart, D.D.; Gladstone's *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*, by Prof. Robertson, D.D.; Foreign Periodicals, Editorial Summary, Record of Select Literature, etc. etc.

We would just add that we are glad to see the Editor now mentions the size and *price* of all books reviewed. This should undoubtedly give additional value to the **Critical Review.**

In **The Sunday Magazine,** three important articles continue subjects begun in January: "Westminster Abbey," by Archdeacon Farrar; "General Booth," by Mr. Stead; and "The Dominion of the Bible," by Dr. William Wright. The Bishop of Ripon has also a good paper on "The Sanctity of the Body." The Editor's Survey is always, however, the most generally interesting feature, and is well done. This is what he says this month of the late Principal of Rawdon:—

The Rev. T. G. Rooke, B.A.

Mr. Rooke's death is a serious loss to the Baptist Churches of the kingdom, for there is still no harder task than to find a man competent in all respects to preside over a denominational college. Those who have the enthusiasm too often lack the learning; and the learned are deficient in force and in fire. Mr. Rooke, save for weak health, which at times made work a burden and aggravated trivial annoyances, was exceptionally qualified for the position he filled at Rawdon College. In his earlier years he had travelled to an unusual extent, and had made himself proficient in Oriental languages. He was an eager student, with wide intellectual sympathies. He had won academic distinction. He believed in his work, and loved it. Fourteen years' experience as minister of the Baptist Church at Frome had given him experience in the practical as well as the intellectual needs of the pastorate. As a teacher, he was abreast with his age. His scholarship was sound, neither servile nor reckless. He could sift evidence and test theory for himself. He was not the man to be swept forwards by fashion, or backwards by panic. When he moved it was always on his own feet, and with his eyes open. He was willing to prove all things, but resolute in holding fast to that which was good. The work he has done in training and inspiring others will long survive him.

The Christian Leader says:—"We are pleased to see one of our esteemed contributors, A. H. Begbie, of Edinburgh, enrolled among the poets of **Good Words.** 'My Ship,' in the February number of the most popular of the religious monthlies, is the happiest bit of verse that has appeared for a long time in any of the monthlies, sacred or secular." But we must not give it; let readers find and judge.

Novels are scarcely in our line; but there is a moral as well as a motto in Dr. Eggleston's "The Faith Doctor," which opens in the February **Century,** worth the attention of students of the Word.

The Sunday at Home has quite an attractive providing this month, of which two notable items are Dr. S. G. Green's three short papers on "Sunday," and the fifth of Professor Sayce's articles on the Assyrians. Dr. Sayce's present paper deals with "The Market, the Money-Lender, and the Tenant," and is full of points for Bible illustration. This is its opening paragraph:—

Rehoboth.

In the tenth chapter of Genesis (ver. 11) mention is made by the side of Nineveh of "the city Rehoboth," which should rather be translated "the public square of the city." It represented, in fact, the great open square on the north-

eastern side of Nineveh, in which the market was held. Every city of Assyria and Babylonia was provided with a similar market-place; here were the magazines of the corn merchants, the booths of the vendors of country produce, and the stalls in which cattle, horses, and camels were sold. It thus differed from the *suqu* or "street"—the "bazaar" of a modern Oriental city—which contained only the regular shops.

In the **Wesleyan Methodist Magazine** for February, the editor reviews Professor Beet's new "Commentary on Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon" (Hodder & Stoughton, 1890, 7s. 6d.), and describes it as "simple and idiomatic in style, modest and cautious in spirit, helpfully explanatory and edifying, both for preachers and for students of the Word of God, and thorough and well weighed in almost every point." The "almost" is remembered further on in a criticism of Mr. Beet's rendering of *harpagmos* (ἁρπαγμός) in Phil. ii. 6. Dr. Gregory looks upon the word as exactly the same here as if *harpagma* had been used, and he is in very good company; but it is doubtful if the last word is spoken yet.

Taking quantity and quality together, **Footsteps of Truth** is probably the cheapest magazine published. It contains forty pages of biblical exposition of the most careful and useful kind, and an occasional illustration besides the frontispiece (this month a portrait of Mr. Henry Thorne), and it is now issued at one penny.

The feature of most permanent interest in the (Chicago) **Standard** is the "Short History of the Baptists," by Henry C. Vedder, which is continued week by week. To the issue of January 29th, Professor J. R. Boise contributes a short paper on the study of the Greek New Testament. What he says (quoting Pres. Olson) of commentaries, that one has time only for the best, is true of all literature—if one knew the best. His recommendations are these: Westcott and Hort for the text; Thayer's Grimm for a dictionary; Young's Concordance; Winer's Grammar; and President Hovey's Commentaries.

The Missionary Review of the World has just reached us, and contains at least one paper of very great interest, by Dr. Ellinwood, under the title, "Buddhism and Christianity: a Crusade which must be met."

The Expositor has also reached us somewhat late this month, too late to receive such notice as an evidently superlative number demands. Dr. Sanday opens with the first of a series of papers on the Synoptic problem, which should prove of great interest and value. Professor Marshall's papers on "The Aramaic Gospel" it is not wise to deal with till the evidence is more fully given. There are other articles of exceptional attraction, an Exposition by Professor Iverach, a literary survey by Dr. Dods, Dr. Perowne's "Notes on Genesis," and a review of Mr. Smith's "Isaiah" by Professor Cheyne.

NOTABLE SERMONS AND EXPOSITIONS IN FEBRUARY.

Gen. i. 26 (Perowne), Expositor.
xvii. 1 (Newbolt), Church of Eng. Pulpit, 790.
xlii. 22 (Spurgeon), Christian Herald, 2, 3.

Josh. xxiv. 15 (Bullock), Fireside.

2 Kings xviii. 4 (Dawson), Methodist Recorder, 1728.

2 Chron. xxxiv., xxxv. (Horton), Christian World, 1766.

Job xix. 25, British Messenger.

Ps. cxxxii. (Chambers), Homiletic Review.
cxxxix. 9, 10 (Macmillan), Quiver.

Prov. xxix. 2 (Horwill), Bible Christian Mag.

Lam. iii. 40 (Hole), Church Bells, 1051.

Matt. v. 8 (Kerr), Treasury.
vii. 12 (Fisher), Amer. S.S. Times, 5.
xi. 28–30 (White), Christian, 1095.

Matt. xiii. 52, United Methodist F.C. Mag.
xiii. 54-56 (Macarthur), Church Bells, 1049.
xvi. 3 (Parker), Christian Commonwealth, 485.

Mark vi. 31 (Macarthur), Church Bells, 1050.
x. 29, 30 (Macgregor), Christian Leader, 474.
xiv. 3 (Perowne), Rock, 1335.

Luke vi. 32, New York Evangelist, 3175.
xiii. 6–9 (Parker), Chr. Commonwealth, 483.
xv. 8 (Hannay), Evangelical Mag.
xxiv. 25 (Stone), Sword and Trowel.

John i. 1–5, Magazine of Christian Literature.
ii. 3–5 (Holland), Rel. Rev. of Reviews.
ii. 5 (Lewis), Churchman (Chicago), 2400.
iv. 7, 41, 42 (Maggs), Sunday at Home.
v. 30 (Meyer), Christian, 1095.
x. 10 (Rankin), Homiletic Review.
xiv. 2 (Stalker), Preacher's Magazine.
xv. 1–8 (Reed), Footsteps of Truth.
xvi. 14 (Liddon), Young Men's Chr. Mag.
xvii. 17 (Birch) Christian Million, 383.
xviii. 18 (Davis), Baptist Magazine.
xviii. 37, United Methodist F. C. Mag.
xxi. 18, 19 (Maclaren), Freeman, 1876.

Acts i. 5 (Hoare), Record, 7594.

Rom. xv. 13 (Birch), Christian Million, 380.

1 Cor. v. 7 (Paterson), Word and Work, 830.
ix. 15 (Parker), Chr. Commonwealth, 487.
xv. 32 (Parker), Chr. Commonwealth, 484.

2 Cor. iv. 1 (Iverach), Expositor.
iv. 6 (Hughes), Methodist Times, 319.
iv. 6 (Dix), Treasury.

Gal. iv. 4–7 (Newberry), Word and Work, 829.
v. 16 (Calthrop), News, 797, 798.

Phil. i. 12 (French), Wesleyan Meth. Mag.
iii. 10 (Savory), British Weekly, 224.

2 Tim. ii. 20, 21 (Maclaren), Freeman, 1877.
iv. 5 (Farrar), Church Times, 1463.

Heb. ii. 9 (Dobbs), Homiletic Review.
iii. 4 (Urquhart), King's Own.

1 Pet. iii. 12 (Jon Churches), of Eng. Pulpit, 789.

2 Pet. i. 2–11 (Gifford), Treasury.

3 John 7 (Maclaren), Homiletic Review.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Professor Graetz contributes an article to the October number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* on the "Origin of the Septuagint," which claims attention alike from the importance of the subject and the eminence of the writer. The current tradition on the subject is clearly and briefly stated by Professor Skinner in his little work, *The Historical Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, and it will be convenient to give that first: "The existence of so many Greek-speaking Jews in Alexandria, and elsewhere, made a Greek translation of the Old Testament almost indispensable. The first impulse to the work seems, however, to have been given by Ptolemy (II.) Philadelphus (B.C. 284–247), who wished to place a copy of the Jewish law, written in Greek, in the great library of Alexandria. According to the Jewish legend, he sent an embassy to the High Priest at Jerusalem to obtain an authentic copy of the Books of Moses, and the services of competent translators. The work of translation was said to have been performed by seventy (or seventy-two) Jewish scholars, hence the name Septuagint or LXX. The remaining books of the Old Testament were translated at various times to meet the wants of the Jewish community of Alexandria, and the whole was completed certainly before the middle of the second century B.C."

The sources of this tradition have been anew examined by Professor Graetz, and have been found so unreliable that the single undeniable fact about the origin of the Septuagint is that its birthplace was Alexandria. Accordingly, in order to ascertain the *date* of the translation, he resorts to internal evidence. What, he asks, does the translation itself say about its origin? And he comes to the unexpected conclusion, by a most unexpected argument, that it was made neither in the days of Ptolemy I., called Soter (as some hold), nor in the days of Ptolemy II., called Philadelphus, but in the days of Ptolemy VI., surnamed Philometor, something like a hundred years later than the common tradition has it.

The external historical evidence which Professor Graetz brings forward to prove that the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch was made so late as the time of Jonathan, the youngest brother and successor of Judas Maccabæus, is slight and inconclusive. He relies chiefly and almost entirely upon the following choice example of internal testimony. One of the main differences that divided the Sadducees and the Pharisees turned on the date of the Feast of Pentecost, and arose out of conflicting interpretations of a text. It is in Lev. xxiii. 15 that the law is found which regulated the date of Pentecost. The words are: "Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven Sabbaths shall there be complete." The Sadducees understood this to mean that the counting was to be made from the day after the Sabbath of the Passover week, and that, therefore, Pentecost, which was exactly seven weeks thereafter, ought always to fall on a Sabbath. The Pharisees interpreted the law differently. By the word "Sabbath" in the

text they understood the first day of the Passover to be meant, whatever day of the week it might be; so that Pentecost, being exactly seven weeks after, might also fall on any day of the week. Now when we turn to the Septuagint rendering of this verse, we find a remarkable divergence from the Hebrew. Their translation is "the day after the first" (*τῆς ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης*), instead of "the day after the Sabbath." "'The first' signifies," says Professor Graetz, "the first day of the Feast of Passover," and the point is that he believes this rendering was *purposely* chosen in order to favour the Pharisaic interpretation of the passage in question. Therefore the translation must have been made after the antagonism between the Sadducees and the Pharisees in reference to the date of Pentecost had become pronounced; and there is no trace of this antagonism earlier than the days of Jonathan Maccabæus. The argument may seem precarious, but it is much more fully and skilfully presented than we have done; and it deserves, and will receive, the attention of scholars.

In the second number of the *Critical Review*, which one can read throughout and rise with an appetite, Professor Ryle discusses the second volume of Mr. George Adam Smith's *Isaiah*. In a short paragraph, the third from the end of the notice, Professor Ryle characterises Mr. Smith's book well, and, at the same time, expresses pointedly one of the most urgent needs of present-day preaching. "It is almost a commonplace now-a-days," he says, "to assert that the great need of Christian congregations, that of continuous Bible teaching, is rarely satisfied. To be scholarly without being pedantic, to be at all thorough without being wearisomely diffuse, to adapt the teaching of whole sections of Scripture to modern spiritual needs without being superficial or sensational,—these are difficulties of which all of us, whether teachers or taught, have had some bitter experience. Where many have failed, Mr. Adam Smith is conspicuously successful. And the secret of his success is to be found, not in his scholarship nor in his eloquence, but in the union of these indispensable qualities with living sympathy in the modern needs of men, and with the intensest realisation that 'the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.'"

In the same number of the *Critical Review* we come upon a geographical note by Professor Sayce of great interest. "Dr. Jensen"—he is reviewing Dr. P. Jensen's recently issued *Kosmologie der Babylonier*—"points out in an Appendix that the Persian Gulf was called by the Babylonians the *nâr marratim*, or 'river of bitterness.' It was therefore considered by them to be not only a river, but the main stream into which flowed the four great rivers — Euphrates, Tigris, Kerkha, and Karun. Here, then, we have at last an explanation of that most difficult passage in Gen. ii. 10, where it is said that 'a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads.' Eden, as is now well known, was Edinu, the plain of Babylonia, the 'garden' of which stood in the neighbourhood of Eridu, on the shores of the gulf. The 'heads' will have been not 'sources' in the ordinary sense of the word, but the mouths of the rivers where the *nâr marratim*, or main stream, seemed to flow into them. It must be remembered that in the inscriptions the rivers are regarded as deriving their waters from the sea."

"The authenticity of John's Gospel," says Dr. Paton Gloag in his newly published *Introduction to the Johannine Writings* (Nisbet, 10s. 6d.), "is the great question of modern criticism, and must be regarded as still unsettled." He points out that the greatest theologians in Germany are nearly equally divided on the question. Weiss, Zahn, Luthardt, and Beyschlag maintain the Johannine origin of the Fourth Gospel; while Schürer, Harnack, Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker, and Hilgenfeld still rank among those who deny it. But in this country the case is quite otherwise. No great British theologian, with the single exception of Dr. Samuel Davidson, denies the authenticity, unless Dr. E. A. Abbott should be added, by his *Encyclopædia Britannica* article. For the present, at least, it may be considered settled here; and the interest of younger scholars is transferred to the problems of the Synoptic Gospels. Will it come up again? It may be that the very Synoptic question will bring it up. It may be that St. John's Gospel has been discussed too exclusively as a separate problem from that of the first three Gospels. There may be intercrossings of the two

great questions which will yet weave them into one, whether to complicate or to simplify, it were hard at present to say.

If the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is not yet finally settled, as Dr. Gloag says, we suppose we must look for it to come up again. And we ought to be prepared for it. The best preparation will be a sincere study of the book itself. Not so much to forge weapons for its defence, though it is most likely that the question will be finally decided from the contents of the book itself, but in order to assure ourselves that its inspired profitableness does not depend upon its authenticity. There may be incompleteness in Dr. Dale's discovery of the seat of religious authority in that which comes home to me, to my human need and aspiration; but the thing which "finds" me in that highest sense (it must be an authoritative word, and no scribe's guessing) is, after all, the thing which is most truly divine to me, and most independent of persons and of date. The Fourth Gospel has "found" men from the beginning,—found them and reformed them, let us say,—and will so find them to the end. To be fully assured of that, is to keep clear of all panic. It is the Christian condition of proving all things, and holding fast that which is good.

The contest may be nearer than we think. We have been so secure in our position that a short paper in the current issue of the *Critical Review*, which combats one point of the positive argument, comes upon us as an unwelcome surprise. But the author, who is the Rev. John A. Cross, M.A., of Little Holbeck, Leeds, says, wisely enough, that we ought not to commit the case to any reasonings which are not entirely relevant and valid, inasmuch as "weakness in any point selected as a point of defence is apt to be taken to imply weakness along the whole line." The book under review is Dr. Salmon's *Introduction*, and Mr. Cross selects for criticism the arguments which Dr. Salmon (following Dr. Sanday) relies upon to prove that the writer of the Fourth Gospel must have been a Jew of the time of Christ. These arguments are seven in number, and we do not think that Mr. Cross has overthrown any one of them utterly, much less destroyed the cumulative effect of them; but his criticisms certainly deserve the attention which must always be given to reverence and scholarship.

"Cicero says: *Appropinquante morte* [*animus*] *multo est divinior.* It is an experimental fact that precisely through the approach of the night of death the most intense effulgence flashes through the human spirit which has sprung from the being of God."

With these words the late Professor Delitzsch opens the second chapter of his *Messianic Prophecies in Historical Succession* (T. & T. Clark, 1891, 5s.). The whole book is a striking witness to the truth of the saying. The proofs, the translator tells us, were read by Dr. Delitzsch while he lay on his death-bed; the last printed sheet was laid on his bed the day before he died. Yet the volume thus brought forth in the midst of death is full of life. "It is a delightful theme," says the author with enthusiasm, "a joyful work in which we propose to be absorbed. The Lord is in the process of coming in the Old Testament, in drawing near, in proclaiming His presence; and we design to transport ourselves into this Old Testament period, and follow the steps of the One who is coming, pursue the traces of the One who is drawing near."

In a time like this it is just such a book we need. Principal Moule of Cambridge is not a man given to panic or wild words; yet even he betrays deep uneasiness at the thought of what criticism may work on a cherished Messianic prophecy. Writing in the *King's Own* for March, on Nathan's promise to David, "it is quite easy," he says, "for the 'naturalist' critic, on his own selected premises, to explain this away. It is easy to say that it was an outcome of Nathan's 'insight,' this reversal of his words of yesterday; that it came, not of nocturnal revelation, but of nocturnal quiet thought. It is easy to say that it had no real scope beyond the temporal fortunes of the Davidic dynasty; that its 'for ever' was relative; that its 'Son of God' was but an Oriental hyperbole of majesty. But such assertions are based on *selected* premises." These words are true, though they manifest anxiety and apprehension; they are true and unexaggerated. Delitzsch, who vividly discerned the gravity of the present crisis, used much

stronger language to describe the "naturalist school of criticism." "There is a crisis in the domain of the Bible, and especially in that of the Old Testament, in which the evening of my life falls. This crisis repels me on account of the joy of its advocates in destruction, on account of their boundless negations and their unspiritual profanity." And, like Mr. Moule, it seems to be just in presence of the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament that he is most deeply moved by the thought of their profanity.

Does Delitzsch reject all criticism then? Does his new book follow the order and arrangement of the Old Testament Scriptures as they have been handed down to us? No. It is emphatically the work of a higher critic. With less hesitation, and to greater breadth than elsewhere, he employs the principles and gathers in the results of a so-called "Higher Criticism." Is there no criticism but an unbelieving anti-supernatural one? He hears that question asked; and he answers it with this book. We may reject its criticism wholly, as we may refuse much of its interpretation; but we cannot separate either from the book itself or from the reverence, the faith, the spirituality, which breathe in every page. One of its most radical pieces of criticism is the relegation of Isa. xxiv.–xxvii. to the days of the Return, and to a later prophet than even the so-called Deutero-Isaiah who wrote chapters xl.–lxvi. Yet this is what we read on a well-known text there—Isa. xxvi. 19, which Delitzsch thus translates: "My dead shall live again, my corpses shall arise; wake up and rejoice, ye who lie in the dust! For the dew of the heavenly bodies is thy dew, and the earth shall bring forth shades."—"It is the entire New Testament Apocalypse which we have here before us *in nuce*, only that, as also in 1 Cor. xv., the discourse is exclusively concerning the resurrection to life, and is also limited to the narrow frame of the 'first resurrection' (Rev. xx. 5). In general, that which is magnificent in these chapters (xxiv.–xxvii.) is that the redemption is conceived of as radical, spiritual for mankind. So that the end of the history of redemption is bound together with the beginning, which is written upon the first pages of Genesis." These are not the tones of an unbeliever.

No, they could not well be the tones of an unbeliever being authentic words of Delitzsch. He who will read the brief memorial which Professor Ives Curtiss has just issued (*Franz Delitzsch: A Memorial Tribute.* With Portrait. T. & T. Clark, 3s.), will receive an indelible impression of the long distance that lay between this man of God and the "unspiritual profanity" of rationalism. We have rarely been able to read with profit the printed prayers which are now so frequently met with in pulpit periodical literature; but there is a prayer here which one is the better for the reading. It is found at the end of an article, says Professor Curtiss, written only two months before his death. How far it is from any concourse with the boundless negations of naturalism!

"Lord Jesus, help us through the Spirit of promise to recognise Thee and Thy Father whose name is in Thee, and in faith to embrace Thee, and to love Thee, though we do not see Thee with the eyes of sense. How else could we return to God in our separation from Him except through Thee? 'Thou art the Way.' How could we be delivered from the pain of doubt and the instability of human opinion except as we hold on to the Word of God through Thy divine mouth. 'Thou art the Truth.' And how could we joyfully go into death if Thy pierced body were not, as it were, the rent veil of the other world? 'Thou art the Life.' Thou hast overcome death and Hades. Thou hast opened heaven for us. We kiss in spirit the marks of the nails in Thy pierced body for us, and cast ourselves at Thy feet which were fastened to the cross for us, and pray to Thee as the Incarnate Love who hast shed Thy blood for us, and cry with Thomas, treading all doubting thoughts beneath our feet, 'My Lord and my God.'"

Why did Delitzsch become a higher critic? "It certainly was a remarkable spectacle," says Professor Curtiss, "but entirely in harmony with the character of the man, that after he had reached the age of nearly threescore years and ten he should have the courage to change his critical views. *It came from an earnest desire to hold that which he deemed truest and best.*" One thing is made clear,—he touched upon it elsewhere himself, and now Professor Curtiss makes it clear in

this little book,—the change was not lightly or easily made. "Few have been called upon to pass through a more trying experience. To put the Torah (the Law of Moses) on the critical dissecting table gave him almost as much pain as Abraham felt when he bound his son to the altar. His religious nature rebelled against the process. It was not so much that he feared the inconsistency of change, as that he feared the effect of these views. His spirit bowed with the deepest reverence before the Scriptures. To him they were like a sacred sanctuary."

What, then, were the considerations which drove him so reluctantly into this position? We cannot always answer. No man can himself tell all the forces that bear upon him in a great change of position,—forces sometimes too minute for apprehension, sometimes too dispersed and impalpable. But in one prominent instance, Delitzsch names two leading reasons in this his latest book, the *Messianic Prophecies*. It is of the authorship of Isaiah, and he says: "1. If we hold that Isaiah is the author of xl.–lxvi., we must maintain a phenomenon which otherwise is without a parallel in the prophetic literature, for otherwise it is everywhere peculiar to prophecy that it goes out from the present, and does not transport itself to the future without returning to the ground of its own contemporary history; but Isaiah would live and act here in the exile, and address the exiles through twenty-seven chapters, without coming back from his ideal to his actual present. 2. The recognition of the divinely ordered training and progress of salvation demands the origin of these addresses under the impulses given by the exile. Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel would represent an incomprehensible retrogression if the author of Isaiah xl.–lxvi. were not younger than Jeremiah, younger even than Ezekiel, and did not have the last third of the exile as his historical station."

The Early Narratives of Genesis.

By the Rev. Professor Herbert E. Ryle, M.A., Cambridge.

The national history of Israel may be said to date from the era of the Exodus and the Covenant of Mount Sinai. The beginnings of the Hebrew race are described in the narrative which tells us of the call of Abraham and records the selection of the family with which are identified the names of the three great ancestors of the chosen people.

But the Hebrew narratives, and the traditions from which our Book of Genesis was compiled, went back into ages infinitely more remote. It was natural for the Hebrew historian to preface his record of the origin of the chosen people with a record of the origin of all nations, the origin of the human race, and the origin of the universe. The materials for such a preface were to hand. He has placed them before us in their simplicity and beauty, making selections from his available resources, so as to narrate in succession the Hebrew stories of the cosmogony, the primæval patriarchs, the Deluge, and the formation of the races.

The fact that we have in these eleven chapters a narrative compiled from two or more different sources is now so generally recognised, that there is no need here for any preliminary discussion upon the subject. This only needs to be stated, that the two principal threads of tradition incorporated in the opening section of Genesis are termed by scholars "Jehovistic" and "priestly," according as they correspond respectively to what may be called the "prophetic" and "priestly" treatment of the early religious history of Israel. But besides these larger and more easily recognised sources of information, the compiler obviously makes use of materials of which the archaic character is evident both from the style and from the subject matter.

The Creation of the Universe (i. 1–ii. 4*a*). The matchless introduction to the whole history is taken in all probability from the priestly writings or some similar literary source. Evidence of this is obtained from characteristic words and phrases, and from the smooth, orderly, and somewhat redundant

*

style. The time was when this opening passage was regarded as the most ancient piece of writing in the Bible. This can no longer be maintained. The smoothness and fulness of its present literary garb show sufficiently that, however ancient its narrative may be, the form in which it has come down to us does not belong to the earliest stages of Hebrew literature.

The recognition of this fact would in itself be fatal to the acceptance of various forms of traditional opinion respecting the origin of Gen. i. 1–ii. 4, or indeed of the whole section, Gen. i.–xi. We may here notice, in passing, the strange, yet commonly held, view that the story of the creation of the world was supernaturally revealed to Adam, and that from him it was word for word transmitted through the families of Enos and Shem, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, until it was finally received and committed to writing by Moses. This is an instance of the extraordinary delusions to which popular assent has been given in cases where direct evidence has not been forthcoming. Ignorance can always call imagination into play, and support its utterances by appeals to the supernatural. But its Nemesis is inevitable. And, in this instance, when philological science summarily disposed of the old assumption that Hebrew was the primitive language upon which the theory of such an infallible verbal tradition logically rested, the bubble was pricked. There is no longer the necessity to contend against a theory, consisting of a series of hypotheses, that could never be substantiated. There is no longer the necessity to object that we have no right to presuppose an orderly and comprehensive tradition in the earliest ages of humanity, even if we were entitled to assign to the first forefathers of our race intellectual gifts capable of preserving and transmitting such a traditional statement respecting the beginning of things.

The argument from the style of the Hebrew in the beginning of Genesis is almost equally opposed to the other common assumption, that it is the record by Moses of a Divine Revelation to himself respecting the origin of the universe. It cannot be admitted that the style of this passage suggests the beginnings of a Hebrew literature, or has any marked resemblance to those portions which are indubitably archaic. We have no evidence or warrant for the assertion that Moses received Divine Revelation upon this topic. It is an unfortunate and precarious method of interpretation that endeavours to substitute a theory of direct superhuman intervention for the explanation dictated by literary criticism. The latter, because it follows the guidance of analogy in other literature, is not on that account less loyal to the recognition of the work of the Holy Spirit.

We are nowhere told that Moses received divine information respecting the beginnings of the universe. And while there are good reasons for not introducing anywhere a theory of direct supernatural agency, where none is recorded in Scripture, there are, among others, two especially good reasons in the case of the opening chapters of Genesis for refusing the application of such a theory.

1. We do not look for instruction upon matters of physical inquiry from revelation in the written Word. God's other gifts to man of learning, perseverance, calculation and the like, have been and are a true source of Revelation. But Scripture supplies no short cuts for the intellect. Where man's intellectual powers may hope to attain to the truth, be it in the region of historical, scientific, or critical study, we have no warrant to expect an anticipation of results through the interposition of supernatural instruction in the letter of Scripture.

Nor is it any sufficient answer that, whereas we should not look for divine instruction upon matters of physical inquiry in the ordinary paths of life, we might reasonably look for it in matters so transcending our capacity as those relating to the creation of the universe. For, on the one hand, we have no right to assume from our present ignorance that the things relating to the formation of the earth and of the planetary system are therefore necessarily beyond human cognisance. The horizon of physical research is constantly widening. We are every year learning more, both of the infinitely remote and of the infinitely vast and minute in time and space. On the other hand, we have no right to assume that, in things distinct from the spiritual and moral life, the letter of Scripture is endowed with omniscience. Scripture is divinely inspired, not to release men from the toil of mental inquiry, but to lead and instruct their souls in the things of "eternal salvation." In regions of thought within the compass of earthly

intuition the books of Scripture reflect the limitations of learning and knowledge which were inseparable from human composition in their own sphere of time and place.

2. The analogy presented by the literature of other nations would lead us to expect that, in the delineation of the formation of the world and of the beginnings of the human race, the simplicity of the narrative would be no guarantee for the scientific accuracy of the story. We cannot exempt Israelite history from the criticism which we should apply to other literature. The Hebrew cosmogony is, for reasons which we shall have to notice further on, conspicuously free from absurdities which detract from the beauty of similar narratives in other literatures. It is not, however, scientifically accurate; nor indeed should we expect it to be, if we were prepared to grant the family likeness of its contents to those of the Assyrian cosmogony. I am well acquainted with numerous, and some of them brilliant, attempts to reconcile, as it is wrongly termed, "religion and science." But no attempt at reconciling Gen. i. with the exacting requirements of modern sciences has ever been known to succeed without entailing a degree of special pleading or forced interpretation to which, in such a question, we should be wise to have no recourse.

In examining the character of this passage (Gen. i.–ii. 4*a*) let us not hesitate to place it upon its proper footing. Its character can only be estimated by comparison with the parallels presented in other literature. Now every nation and race has had its cosmogony or legendary account respecting the origin of the world and the early days of the nation's ancestors. Traditions of this kind are found in every variety. Each variety represents tribal intermixture or the influences of climate and environment. The infancy of races is only capable of understanding abstract ideas by means of simple and pictorial representations. Upon these the genius of each race has left its characteristic impress, sometimes poetical, sometimes whimsical, sometimes philosophical, sometimes religious.

If now we treat the Israelite cosmogony as inseparable in its main features from such representations, what do we find? Let us search and see.

We employ in our search the two divine forces of knowledge—the perfect revelation of things spiritual in the person of Jesus Christ, and the progressive revelation of things material through the gifts of the Holy Spirit in the intellect of mankind. The narrative upon which our search is employed relates to three distinct conceptions, upon the determination of which the current of all religious thought and conduct depends. These are the conceptions of the physical universe, mankind, and the Godhead.

It appears to me that our judgment upon the character of the Israelite cosmogony should be based upon the treatment in Genesis (i.–xi.) of these three fundamental conceptions.

(*a*) The Physical Universe. It would not be difficult to show that the Hebrew cosmogony is closely allied to other early cosmogonies in its imperfect and, as we should term it, unscientific conception, both of the formation of the earth and the heavenly bodies, and of the production of the vegetable and animal world. It is, for instance, only a non-natural interpretation which considers the "days" of Gen. i., in spite of the mention of "evening" and "morning," to be vast periods of time; it is only, again, a non-natural interpretation which explains the formation of the sun and the moon on the "fourth" day as intelligible to modern science, on the assumption that the nebular hypothesis is anticipated. If, as seems to be the only candid line of exegesis, we adopt a genuinely literal interpretation, if we admit the presence of statements incompatible with modern scientific discoveries, we shall, at least, show a resolution to be above all things and at all costs fair. We shall then follow with especial curiosity the points of correspondence in the cosmogony of Genesis with that of the nations closely akin to the Israelites. But we shall also concede that its description of the physical universe is unscientific, as judged by modern standards, and that it shares the limitations of the imperfect knowledge of the time at which it was committed to writing. On the other hand, from the religious point of view, we cannot fail to recognise the pure and elevated conception of the Material Universe which is presented to us in this portion of Genesis. Not self-existent nor divine, as some taught in those days, nor inherently evil and antagonistic to God

and man, as others taught, the Universe is presented to us as coming into being at the will of a Divine Creator, its formation following the stages of an ordered development, its essential character pleasing and good. It is a picture which, if it clashes with exact science, agrees in its highest conceptions with the teaching of the purest philosophy of religion.

(*b*) Mankind. The description of man's origin and nature in the cosmogony of Genesis is of great importance. It is viewed, as it were, from two aspects, the physical and the spiritual, the earthly and the divine. So far as his physical origin is touched upon, the narrative is expressed in the simple terms of prehistoric legend, of unscientific pictorial description. We feel that so far as his physical origin and his material structure are concerned, the advances of modern physiological research are more likely to furnish a key to the great mystery than are the pages of Genesis. But when we pass from the consideration of man's physical structure to the consideration of him as one endowed with spiritual powers, moral duties, and intellectual gifts, we are lifted at once into an atmosphere where we find every item of the description is marvellously and perfectly in harmony with the highest religious conception of man revealed to us in the teaching of the Incarnation. We see him made in the image and likeness of God; a living soul derived from the Divine Spirit; gifted with powers of intellect, with freedom of will, with the witness of conscience. It is as if, with the passage from the physical to the spiritual region, we had left the atmosphere of "childish" things and had been exalted to the contemplation of "men" whose citizenship is in heaven.

(*c*) The Godhead. Even more strikingly does this exaltation of conception appear when the subject is wholly spiritual, or almost wholly so, as it is in the description of the Godhead. The only exception here arises from the anthropomorphic language incidental to the presentation of the narrative. But the divine pre-existence, the divine omnipotence, the paramount purpose of love, the infinite hatred of sin, these and other attributes of the divine nature are depicted in the narrative in a degree that immeasurably elevates the traditions of Israel above all similar records in the known literature of other nations.

Does not this summary of an investigation assist us towards a conclusion, which will recognise the combination of the two essential elements in the inspiration of all Holy Scripture, the human form and the spiritual teaching? In these early chapters of Genesis there is present the simple narrative of the cosmogony current in the Hebrew branch of the Semitic race. But this is not all. There is also present the teaching of the Spirit, for the revelation of which the Israelite people were the appointed channel, that it might be known among men. If now the three fundamental conceptions —the world, human nature, and God—be regarded as divided into two groups, the physical (*i.e.* the world and man's physical origin and nature) and the spiritual (*i.e.* man's spiritual origin and the Being of God), we can discern the secular, the childlike, the imperfect teaching of Genesis upon the former group co-existent with, nay, furnishing a vehicle for, the religious, the inspired, the divine teaching of Genesis upon the latter.

We have, then, in the first chapters of Genesis the Hebrew version of a great Semitic epic dealing with the beginning of all things. It has not come down to us in that earliest form in which, we may assume, it was known to the fathers of the Israelite race who "dwelt on the other side of the flood," and "served other gods" (Josh. xxiv. 2). It has not come down to us in that setting of bewildering mythology in which we find the similar and congenital Assyrian tradition embedded. It has come down to us in the form which it has received from the minds of devout Israelites, moved by the Spirit of God, and penetrated with the pure belief in the spiritual Jehovah. The saints and prophets of Israel stripped the old legend of its pagan deformities. Its shape and outline survived. But its spirit was changed, its religious teaching and significance transfigured in the light of the Revelation of the LORD. The popular tradition was not abolished; it was preserved, purified, hallowed, that it might subserve the Divine purpose of transmitting, as in a figure, spiritual teaching upon eternal truths.

We must reserve for a later contribution a reference to the cognate Assyrian cosmogony, and a fuller treatment of "the Days of Creation" than it has been possible to give in the foregoing general remarks.

Recent Literature in Apologetics.

A GUIDE TO THE BUYING OF BOOKS.

II.

III.

THE RECORD OF REVELATION—THE OLD TESTAMENT.

(Books on the Higher Criticism are reserved for a future article.)

PUBLISHERS—Hodder & Stoughton.
AUTHOR — C. Loring Brace, author of "Gesta Christi."
TITLE—The Unknown God ; or, Inspiration among Pre-Christian Races. 8vo, pp. xii., 336. 1890, 12s.

"It would," said Professor Sanday recently, "be little in accordance with Christian doctrine to maintain that the divine influences which were vouchsafed in so large a measure to select spirits in Palestine were wholly wanting in India or Greece. It is impossible to read the life and teaching of Gautama without feeling that he too had an impulse from the Holy One." It is in that belief that the late Mr. Loring Brace made the patient research, of which the fruit is this volume. Not in Buddhism only, but in all the great non-Christian religions, and even in some philosophies, the evidences of divine inspiration are traced. Impelled by a faith that God's providence is broader than we deem, Mr. Brace has produced a treasury of all that is best in human thought outside Judaism and Christianity, the like of which nowhere else exists.

PUBLISHER—John Murray.
AUTHOR—Rev. C. Pritchard, D.D., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Astronomy, Oxford.
TITLE—Occasional Thoughts of an Astronomer on Nature and Revelation. Crown 8vo, pp. xi., 273. 1889, 7s. 6d.

The greater part of Professor Pritchard's *Nature and Revelation* is anti-agnostic, but for the sake of the three papers which end the book it may be placed here. These papers are courageous efforts made by a distinguished astronomer to interpret three passages in the record of revelation in which astronomy has a right to speak—the sun standing still, the star of the Magi, and the Creation Proem. The interpretation is on the lines laid down in the British Association discourses and Congress addresses, which form the bulk of the volume. On the one side, there is strict fidelity to the assured gains of science; on the other, firm belief in the supernatural revelation recorded in the Bible. But, however close the kinship between these two, the effort is never made to fit the one into the mould of the other. The unmistakable honesty, the acknowledged ability, and the spiritual earnestness of the book should make it a power in the conflict with religious indifference.

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.
AUTHOR—Samuel Harris, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University.
TITLE—The Self-Revelation of God. 8vo, pp. xii., 570. 1887, 12s.

"What is religion? 'Tis man seeking God"—so repeats the latest product of Unitarian theology. Professor Harris has written this book to prove that it is altogether the reverse of that. *The Self-Revelation of God* is divided into four parts, which may serve as a sketch of its plan: 1. God revealed in experience or consciousness as the object of religious faith and service. 2. God revealed in the universe as the Absolute Being. 3. God revealed in the universe as Personal Spirit through the constitution and course of nature, and the constitution and history of man. 4. God revealed in Christ as the Redeemer of man from sin. But such a bare enumeration can give no hint of the great ability and interest of the book, the subject of which is *the* apologetic question of to-day. Professor Harris has been called through successive offices to hold one of the highest which America can offer, and this volume is worthy of his position.

PUBLISHERS—James Nisbet & Co.
AUTHOR—Rev. W. A. Mathews, M.A., Vicar of St. Lawrence, Appleby, Hon. Canon of Carlisle, and Proctor in Convocation.
TITLE — The Witness of the World to Christ. Crown 8vo, pp. 240. 1889, 3s. 6d.

By its unpretending appearance and modest introduction, Canon Mathews' *Witness of the World to Christ* runs the risk of missing the place and the popularity which it deserves. Its title also is unfortunate, though it might be hard to suggest another at once comprehensive and distinctive. For the range of the work is from "Science and Theology" to "The Life of the World to Come," and that, not in detached essays, but by a continuous chain of expositions and argument. One chapter alone should "make" the book at such a time as this. It goes by the perfectly hackneyed title of "Natural Religion," but it is anything but hackneyed in thought.

PUBLISHERS—The Religious Tract Society.
AUTHORS—Various.
TITLE—Present Day Tracts on Man in Relation to the Bible and Christianity. Crown 8vo. 1889, 3s. 6d.

This "special" volume contains eight of the most scholarly of the whole series. They are these: "The Age

and Origin of Man Geologically Considered," by S. R. Pattison, F.G.S., and Dr. Friedrich Pfaff; "The Antiquity of Man Historically Considered," by Canon Rawlinson; "Man Physiologically Considered," by A. Macalister, M.D.; "Man a Free Agent," by Prebendary Row; "The Witness of Man's Moral Nature to Christianity," by Prof. Radford Thomson; "The Adaptation of the Bible to the Needs of Man," by Dr. Blaikie; "Revelation and Natural Science," by Sir J. William Dawson; and "Christ and Creation," by the Rev. W. S. Lewis, M.A.

PUBLISHER—Richard D. Dickinson.
AUTHOR—Joseph Cook.
TITLE—God in the Bible. 8vo, pp. vi., 221. 1889, 3s. 6d.

Mr. Cook's purpose in the thirteenth series of the Boston Monday Lectures was to discover a verifiable definition of inspiration. He investigates chiefly the phenomena of the Old Testament; but he relies much more upon the testimony wrung from the unbiassed republic of literature and science. It need not be said that he shows himself master of an astonishing range of appropriate material. There is a liberal education in such a volume, be its thesis proved or not. The preludes to the lectures are timely and telling. At a Symposium on Inspiration, which concludes the volume, there sit many of the leading theologians of America.

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.
AUTHOR—Dr. Fr. H. Reusch, Professor of Catholic Theology in the University of Bonn.
TITLE—Nature and the Bible: Lectures on the Mosaic History of Creation in its Relation to Natural Science. Translated from the Fourth Edition by Kathleen Lyttelton. Revised and corrected by the Author. 8vo, 2 vols., pp. 461, 372. 1886, 21s.

In the great controversy between the various sciences and the early chapters of Genesis, a controversy which will not be settled for many a day, there is no book so full of help and hope as Dr. Reusch's *Nature and the Bible*. For many years scholars have turned to Mr. Quarrier's able volume, but, more limited also in scope, it has always been limited in its influence, and now is passing out of date. Dr. Reusch will also pass out of date, but not, it is probable, till most of the questions are laid to rest. For he enters into the discussions with so competent a knowledge, and in so generous a spirit, that, come what adjustments may from the side either of biblical interpretation or scientific theory, the great principles here expounded and applied will always hold their ground. The title-page is much too limited. Even the first volume passes beyond the Creation, and contains a most important discussion on the Deluge; while the second deals with the wider questions of the origin, unity, and antiquity of man.

IV.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

PUBLISHER—T. Fisher Unwin.
AUTHOR—George Park Fisher, D.D., LL.D., Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University.
TITLE—The Nature and Method of Revelation. Crown 8vo, pp. xvi., 291. 1890, 4s. 6d.

That portion of Professor Fisher's *Nature and Method of Revelation*, which gives the work its title, consists of four papers which recently appeared in the *Century*. They are popular in style, but well abreast of the scholarship of the day; and it is notable that Dr. Sanday, in his newly issued *Oracles of God*, commends the volume thus, "As a simple and popular survey of the ground it does not seem easy to name a better book." Still, the five essays which appear here for the first time, and which occupy nearly half the space, are as intelligible and certainly not less instructive. They deal with (1) The Authorship and Date of the Gospels; (2) Illustrations of the Character of the Gospel Histories; (3) Prophecies of the Time of the Second Advent; (4) The Theology of Matthew Arnold; (5) Huxley's Comments on the Gospel Narratives.

PUBLISHERS—The Religious Tract Society.
AUTHORS—Various.
TITLE—Present Day Tracts on the Non-Christian Religions of the World. Crown 8vo. 1888, 2s. 6d.

Great names are here, and they write on subjects which sympathetic knowledge only makes more interesting: "Islam," by Sir William Muir; "Confucianism," by Professor Legge; "The Parsis and the Zend-Avesta," by Dr. Murray Mitchell; "Hinduism," by the same; "Buddhism," by Dr. Reynolds; and "Ancient Paganism," by Dr. Mitchell.

PUBLISHERS—Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier, Edinburgh.
AUTHOR—Rev. A. Scott Matheson, Dumbarton.
TITLE—The Gospel and Modern Substitutes. Crown 8vo, pp. 319. 1890, 5s.

Mr. Matheson's book has already received notice in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. i. p. 239), and a second reading confirms the judgment then expressed.

PUBLISHERS—Hodder & Stoughton.
AUTHOR—R. W. Dale, LL.D., Birmingham.
TITLE—The Living Christ and the Four Gospels. Crown 8vo, pp. xii., 299. 1890, 6s.

The first four of the fourteen lectures in Dr. Dale's *The Living Christ* are the most valuable. In them the "argument from experience" is put with a charm and a power that are irresistible. Certainly the rest of the volume, which traces the historical evidence for the Gospels back

from Eusebius to Polycarp is well done. Indeed it would be hard to find better popular lectures on the subject. But the armour is not so manifestly David's own, and something is missed of the confidence and precision of the earlier argument. It is, notwithstanding, a notable book, for a strong man has thrown his strength into it.

PUBLISHERS—Cassell & Company.
AUTHOR—James Aitchison, Minister of Erskine Church, Falkirk.
TITLE—Signa Christi: Evidences of Christianity set forth in the Person and Work of Christ. Crown 8vo, pp. xii., 296. 1890, 5s.

Signa Christi is the title which Mr. Aitchison has given to six lectures, which were first spoken to the members of a senior Bible class, and then published at their desire. They desired well. These lectures deserve a wider audience. The second especially, on the Teaching of Christ, is an original contribution to the subject, thorough and convincing. And the last, on the Living Witness in the Church and the World, is scarcely less satisfactory. To occupy new apologetic ground on some of the others is scarcely possible, but the old is well mastered.

PUBLISHERS—James Nisbet & Co.
AUTHOR—Rev. Henry Norris Bernard, M.A., LL.B.
TITLE—The Mental Characteristics of the Lord Jesus Christ. Crown 8vo, pp. xii., 314. 1888, 6s.

To find a title for a book, especially a book on Apologetics, seems to be harder than to write the book itself. Mr. Bernard's title is neither very appropriate nor very pleasing. His subject is as wide as "Ecce Homo," and deals with it in separate chapters on selected topics, in some of which, as in that on Christ's prayers, there is no reference to His mental characteristics. Had the subject promised by the title been adhered to, a monograph of considerable apologetic value might have resulted, for Mr. Bernard has the ability to write it. There is less room for the work actually accomplished. But the book deserves a place in recent apologetic literature.

PUBLISHERS—Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
AUTHOR—Rev. George Frederick Maclean, D.D.
TITLE—The Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist: being the Boyle Lectures for 1879, 1880. Third Edition, revised and corrected. Crown 8vo, pp. xxiv., 352. 1890, 4s.

Apologetics, like every other modern study, must be specialised. And it is just by such monographs as this that the best work is likely to be done in the future. Dr. Maclean's book is beyond our present time-limit, but this third edition has been so carefully revised that it deserves a place and special attention. These lectures prove that lectures may be popular, and yet do their work with so much accurate scholarship that it is done once for all.

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.
AUTHOR—Karl Sell, D.D., Ph.D., Darmstadt.
TITLE—The Church in the Mirror of History: Studies on the Progress of Christianity. Translated by Elizabeth Stirling. Crown 8vo, pp. viii., 250. 1890, 3s. 6d.

Readers of Dr. Sell's lectures on the History of Christianity owe a grudge to the translator for the unlovely title she has given the book, and those who are kept thereby from becoming readers will owe a deeper grudge. But the translation is good, for which much may be forgiven. A phrase in the author's Preface seems to indicate that he had "the cultured classes" most in mind; but there need be no caste distinction in the readers of the book. Dr. Sell's aim is apologetic, and he rightly judges that the best apologetic for Christianity is an impartial record of what Christianity has wrought.

PUBLISHER—Charles H. Kelly.
AUTHOR—Rev. William Unsworth.
TITLE—The Aggressive Character of Christianity; or, Church Life and Church Work. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. Crown 8vo, pp. viii., 308. 1889, 3s. 6d.

Though Mr. Unsworth's book comes properly enough under this survey, he himself has no more love for the word "Apologetics" than Dr. Martineau. Christianity is not an apology, and should need none. It is an aggressive power. If not aggressive, it is not a power. Mr. Unsworth is not one who piously watches the world grow ranker in wickedness that the coming of the Lord may be hastened. He believes in the ultimate triumph of Christianity in the world. This is the work of the Church, and in the last half of his book he describes the qualifications which the Church needs for that work.

PUBLISHERS—Thomas Nelson & Sons.
AUTHOR—Rev. John Inglis, D.D., F.R.S.G.S.
TITLE—Bible Illustrations from the New Hebrides, with Notices of the Progress of the Mission. Crown 8vo, pp. xii., 356. 1890, 5s.

In Mr. Inglis' book we find the Church at work in the world. Every successful mission and its record is an apologetic. But the apologetic in this volume is special. The truth of some of the most remarkable occurrences in the Bible is illustrated and confirmed by the actual customs of these "primitive" tribes. It is similar testimony to that of the monuments; and sometimes it is both surprising and instructive. It is an unworked field of apologetic which gives promise of even better things to come.

PUBLISHERS—Macmillan & Co.
AUTHOR—W. Boyd Carpenter, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Ripon.
TITLE—The Permanent Elements of Religion. The Bampton Lectures of 1887. 8vo, pp. 424. 1889, 14s.

Dr. Boyd Carpenter's Bampton Lectures will fitly close the present survey. The history of Christianity is, rightly viewed, one of the strongest apologetics; but that history is not merely of the past. The volumes just noticed show that in its present attitude there lies an evidence really impregnable, notwithstanding all shortcomings. And that history, which is past and present, is also future. For prophecy is history where the elements relied upon are essential and indestructible. This is the apologetic which the Bishop of Ripon advances here, and it is handled in a way that is worthy of its greatness.

Requests and Replies.

Would you kindly inform me which is the best commentary on the Book of Revelation. "The Revelation of St. John," by Prof. Milligan, D.D., in the Expositor's Bible, has been recommended to me. I see Spurgeon recommends "Revelation," by C. B. Elliott, M.A., as the standard work on the subject. What is your opinion of the relative merits of these books, and which of the commentaries on Revelation is the best, taking into consideration—(1) Accuracy; (2) Abreast of modern scholarship; (3) Serviceableness in the pulpit?
J. M. P.

Your correspondent's question, Which is the best commentary on Revelation? is very much like the question, Which is the best policy to apply to Ireland? or, Which is the surest cure for consumption? Unanimity on the subject has not yet been reached. Every commentary on the Revelation contains a theory of the book, and these theories are as numerous as the stars, and as far away from one another as the poles. Without fear one may say that *good* books on the Seven Churches are Trench, Marcus Dods, and Plumptre. Not very profound but useful practical lectures on the Revelation are those of Vaughan (of the Temple); more thoughtful, though more complicated with theory, are those of Fred. D. Maurice (who is what is called a preterist). Dr. Milligan's books, both his Commentary (*Pop. Comm. on N. T.*, edited by Schaff; T. & T. Clark) and in the *Expositor's Bible*, contain a great deal of excellent homiletical and practical matter, often very felicitously expressed. His theory of the Revelation, however, reduces it to one huge commonplace, in which everything distinctive disappears, and all the great figures—Jerusalem, Babylon, big beast and little beast—have ultimately very much the same meaning, the whole of them more or less being figurative expressions of the idea that the Church degenerates and becomes secularised and worldly—an idea which, perhaps, does not appear in the Apocalypse at all, except in a modified form in the Epistles to the Churches. As a repertory of opinion, ancient and modern, the Commentary of the late Archdeacon Lee of Dublin, in the *Speaker's Bible*, is exceedingly useful. The great work of E. B. Elliott (the initials C. B. in Spurgeon must be a mistake), *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, 4 vols., 1862, is an exceedingly entertaining book, full of learning and interesting historical illustrations, and embellished with cuts of seals and other things, among them portraits of the "horsemen" from the Euphrates. The book is strongly anti-papal, and of course is based upon the historical or continuous system of interpretation, which finds in the Apocalypse a history of the Church and the world in hieroglyphs. This system of interpretation now finds little favour, and Elliott's book, though diverting still, has lost its former prestige. The little work of Simcox (*Cambridge Bible for Schools*, 1890) comes nearer to the prevailing modern view of the meaning of the Apocalypse perhaps than any other. A large work lately published is *The Practical Teaching of the Apocalypse*, by G. V. Garland (Longmans, 16s.). A work by Principal Brown of Aberdeen on the Apocalypse has lately been announced (Hodder & Stoughton).—A. B. Davidson.

Can you name any books—or open out the question—on the way in which the spiritual nature of man is transmitted? To which theory does the Evangelical Church lean—Creationism or Traducianism?—J. B.

This branch of anthropology belongs rather to philosophy than to theology.

To read on the subject, a good start may be made with Shedd's succinct account (*Hist. Doc.* ii. 3–26).

Tertullian's realism made Traducianism welcome to him; and probably it was so with Luther. Augustine seemed afraid of committing himself to either theory. Origen held a Platonic theory of the pre-existence of souls. Lactantius, Jerome,

Hugo St. Victor, P. Lombard, Hilary of Pictavium, and Aquinas were Creationists. Anselm, like many others, was against Traducianism. In patristic times, Creationism prevailed in the East and afterwards in the West also; and it was declared by individuals to be the doctrine of the Church. The members of the Lutheran Church have oscillated between the two theories. Those of the Reformed have generally been Creationists. Jon. Edwards was a Traducianist.

According to Creationism, God creates *ex nihilo* the soul of every child sometime before birth, while the physical and animal part is derived from the parents by natural generation. According to Traducianism the soul was created in Adam, and is derived by natural generation as the living body is.

Zech. xii. 1; Isa. xlii. 5; Num. xvi. 22; Heb. xii. 9; John v. 17; Ps. xxxiii. 5; Gen. ii. 7, and iii. 19, are quoted in favour of Creationism. And for Traducianism, Rom. v. 12–19; 1 Cor. xv. 22; Eph. ii. 3; Heb. vii. 10; Ps. li. 5; Gen. v. 3.

Creationism agrees with that individuality of choice and responsibility by which each man determines his own character and destiny, and with the immateriality, simplicity, and indivisibility of the soul, and so keeps clear of the materialistic complications involved in Traducianism. It harmonises with the doctrine of the sinlessness of Jesus.

Against Creationism it is argued that it implies continual acts of creation. But no Scripture teaches that all souls were created on the sixth day.

It is thought not to agree with that view of the solidarity of the race which regards each man as but an extension of the one man, as the branches, leaves, and fruit are extensions of the one tree—that view which also implies but one ultimate destiny for the whole race. But that view accords neither with Scripture nor experience, where the propagation is like that of the separated seed of the tree, and where beyond a certain limit different individuals go off voluntarily to opposite eternal destinies.

With more force it is objected that a newly created spirit must be morally pure. But it may nevertheless immediately contract the fallen state by identification with the body, and so with the race and with Adam.

Traducianism is supposed to harmonise best with the doctrine of original sin. But, on the opposite theory, that evil may come to every child by means of his oneness with the race, and Adam's representative relation to him. Original sin is not literally a stream or substance, but a moral state caused, not by the Creator of the spirit, in Adam or afterwards, but by the sin which belonged to the one whole race. On the theory of Traducianism, if the soul be indivisible, all souls were in Adam, and nearly all in his immediate posterity, and so on, gradually diminishing until all are distributed, and further procreation becomes impossible. What can we understand by all souls being numerically in Adam? If all were in him, then nearly all were in Cain and Seth. But Adam's headship, though ontological, was still more moral. Or if Traducianism say the soul of the child is literally derived from the spiritual substance of the parent like a spark from the fire, then there is a parturition such as is only possible to matter; if derived from both parents, there is also a joining of parts to constitute that which can have no parts: and in either case, the one spirit of Adam, or the spirits of Adam and Eve, are subdivided millions of times. But besides the absurdity of dividing a spirit, we have then a constant diminution and weakening; so that Adam's soul was many millions of times more than any one of to-day—indeed, more than equal to the souls of all his posterity. For (*ex hypothesi*) the generated souls cannot, like the bodies, feed and grow by their material environment. When Levi in the loins of Abraham paid tithes, it is not suggested that Levi's soul was in Abraham's loins. So when we all fell in Adam it was not necessary that our very souls should literally exist in him.

Again, if Traducianism be necessary to identify all men with Adam under the curse, the same sort of argument would make it necessary for Christ's soul to have literally descended from Adam in order that He might be properly man, and redeem man from the curse. But how then could He be sinless? In favour of Traducianism, it is said the child often inherits the mental and moral qualities of his parents. But much, if not all, of that might be accounted for as the result of physical constitution and conformation, training, imitation, and kindred causes. But, after all, thick clouds of mystery rest on the question; and we can the better afford to refrain from dogmatising, as no positive belief on the question is imposed by Scripture, or necessary to salvation.—MARSHALL RANDLES.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xiii. 13.

"But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love" (R.V.).

Exposition.

"*But now*" cannot be taken in the sense of time, it has a logical force, introducing an inference: "and so we see," *nunc autem.—Edwards.*

The three *virtues* (faith, hope, love) are contrasted with the three previously spoken of *gifts* (tongues, prophecy, knowledge) which are to cease with the future era, and not to enter into the perfect state. "Now" cannot mean "at the present time," for, if these virtues also only belonged to the present epoch, there would be no contrast to set up in respect of duration between them and gifts.—*Godet.*

Does it mean, then, that faith and hope, as well as love, shall abide eternally? But, according to St. Paul, faith, in the perfect state, must give place to sight (2 Cor. v. 7), and hope to possession (Rom. viii. 24). Hence some hold that faith and hope will last till the end of the present economy, but will pass away then; while the gifts were to cease with the first ages. But there is no such distinction made by Paul. The present period is represented as unbroken, and the gifts as only ceasing when it ceases. Others take the word "abide" in a logical sense, "remain in full *value*" (Holsten); or "abide in their fruits" (Grotius), believing will remain in seeing as hoping in possessing, for sight has come through faith, and possession through hope (Hofmann). But all this is to do violence to the meaning of the word "abide." Nearer the meaning is Meyer,—Faith remains eternally the means of our communion with Christ, and hope will never cease to catch new perspectives of glory, even in the perfect state. But better still, Kling (in Lange's Bible), says: While love is the real possession of the Divine, faith and hope belong to its acquisition. Now, is this acquisition a fact which can ever cease? Eternal blessings are not like a bag of gold pieces, which are received once for all. The permanent essence of the creature is to have nothing of its own, to be eternally helpless and poor. Every instant it must take possession of God by faith, which grasps the manifestations which He has already given; and by hope, which prepares to lay hold of His new manifestations. It is not once for all, it is *continually* that, in eternity, faith changes into vision, and hope into possession. These two virtues, therefore, abide to live again unceasingly.—*Godet.*

We have seen that faith and hope abide continually as well as love, but undergoing incessant transformation, the one into sight, the other into possession. It is not so with love. Love does not see, does not acquire. It *is* the Divine. God does not believe nor hope,—He loves. Love belongs to His essence. Like God Himself it could not change its nature except for the worse. Love is the end in relation to which the two other virtues are only means, and this relation remains even in the state of perfection. Hence love is the greatest.—*Godet.*

Love is described in verse 7 as *believing* all things, and *hoping* all things, and so may rightly be deemed the sustaining principle of, and therefore greater than, faith and hope.—*Ellicott.*

But it is a first and foremost place among equals.—*Church.*

Methods of Treatment.

I.

Now abideth Faith, Hope, Love.

By the Very Rev. Henry Alford, D.D.

"*Love never faileth.*" In this it is distinguished from all "gifts," which are in their nature fragmentary and obscure, and must cease when that which is perfect and whole has been obtained. Nor is love thus alone, there are three graces that never fail,—faith, hope, and love,—these three, and these only. But the greatest of these three is love, greatest among the enduring graces of eternity.

Faith abides for ever. An unwavering trust in God will form a component part of the character of the saints in glory, an entire resting for the present and for the future on His wisdom and His love. The highest saint will be far beneath the unapproachable perfections of God, in which His renewed powers will always have scope to exercise themselves. A progress there will be towards the perfect likeness of Christ, which will not be put on in an instant; a striving ever upward after more knowledge of God, more love to God, more obedience; and of this advance, faith will be the condition and basis.

Hope abides for ever. Hope shall not be lost in joy, since joy will not be one great pleasure once imparted, but springs ever up afresh. The awakening to new delights and new faculties shall bring

new hopes also. Hope *disappointed* there shall be none, for hope shall be based on certainty. Hope *deferred* there shall be none, for the state of trial will be over.

And *Love* abides for ever. For that state is its proper sphere, and only perfect example. And of these three, love is the greatest. Faith and hope have their chief work here on earth; love's chief work lies there. Faith and hope are but the conditions of the employment of the glorified; while love is that employment itself. Faith and hope lead on to new degrees and new exercises of love. Love is the character of God Himself, who has nothing to aspire to, and needs none to lean upon.

II.

Hope.

By the Very Rev. R. W. Church, D.D.

The question occurs to us sometimes why hope should be ranked so high, placed on a level with faith and charity. We can understand why faith should be so singled out; it is the foundation of the whole structure of religion. Still more can we understand it of charity, for charity brings us near, in the essential qualities of character, to Him whom we believe in and worship. But hope is thought of, at first sight, as a self-regarding quality, which throws forward its desires into the future, and dwells in what it imagines of happiness for itself. Hope, too, of all things, is delusive and treacherous.

But Scripture, from first to last, is one unbroken persistent call to hope—to look from the past and present to the future. Hope, never destroyed, however overthrown, is the prominent characteristic of the Old Testament, hope of the loftiest kind even after the most fatal defeats. St. Paul may be said to have characterised Scripture as above everything the Book of Hope. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope." Hope is one of the great and necessary springs of full religious action. What gives it its moral value is that, in its higher form, it is a real act and striving of the will. It is on our wild and wayward imagination that the forces play both of fear and hope. It is there that fear conjures up dangers—omens of coming trouble; and it is there that hope is exercised—an exercise, it may well be, of self-mastery, to enlist imagination on the side of God as the ally and enlightener and support of faith.

And hope is a great instrument of spiritual and moral discipline. Long waiting is God's appointed order. We are often tempted to be depressed. But "we are saved by hope."

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

As Paul so often does (1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 3, 4; Col. i. 4, 5), he here sums up the Christian life in the three dispensations—*faith*, which takes salvation as already accomplished, Christ come; *hope*, which goes out to the part of salvation yet to be accomplished, Christ coming again; and *charity*, which embraces the ever-abiding Christ, and in Him all beings, and which is already salvation itself realised in the individual.—*Godet.*

The redemption of man begins with faith, and proceeds through hope, and ends in love, until all is summed up in the matured conviction of the last Apostle, that "God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him."—*H. Wace.*

Faith.

What keeps the glorified in *continued possession* of salvation is their abiding trust in the atonement which took place through the death of Christ. Not as if their everlasting glory might be lost by them, but it is their assured possession just through the fact that to them as fellow-heirs of Christ in the very beholding and sharing His glory, the faith, through which they *become* blessed, must remain *incapable of being lost.* The everlasting fellowship with Christ in the future age (αἰών) is not conceivable at all without the everlasting continuance of the living ground and bond of this fellowship, which is faith.—*Meyer.*

We now walk by faith, not at all by sight. When Christ appears we shall walk by faith, *because* by sight. All fellowship between one person and another must be by faith, if faith is rightly understood. Chrysostom was led to deny the need of faith in heaven by his definition of faith. If it is an act of the intellect, which believes certain promises on the ground of its belief concerning the promises, then faith ceases when the promises are fulfilled. The word *is* used in this sense in the New Testament. But the grace of faith needs the assent of the heart as well as of the intellect. The Reformers insisted on the inclusion of *fiducia*, trust, in their definition of *fides*. They transferred the fulcrum of the spiritual life from the intellect to the will.—*Edwards.*

Hope.

Hope in its established New Testament sense, hope of the everlasting glory (Rom. v. 1), this abides for the glorified with regard to the everlasting duration and continued development of their glory. In 1 Cor. xv. 24, steps in the development of the future kingdom are manifestly given, as, indeed, the everlasting *glory* generally, according to its essential character as *life*, is not conceivable at all without development to even higher perfection for the individual, and therefore also is not conceivable without the continuance of hope.—*Meyer.*

ONLY one place has inscribed over its portals,—

"Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

New glories, new treasures of knowledge and love, will ever raise and nourish blessed hopes of yet more and higher,—hopes which no disappointment will blight.—*Alford.*

THERE may be a faith almost without hope, a faith which believes on though it can see nothing; a faith which refuses to be comforted, which will not let the distant picture of better things rise before it, but yet trusts, ever in the darkness, to God's truth and goodness. It is the deep and awful faith of him who said, "Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him." But the human spirit can hardly stand long the strain of a hopeless faith. Hope is the energy and effort of faith.—*R. W. Church.*

A HOPE that, by its inherent life, bursts the bands of fatalism, and cannot be held down with reflections on the degeneracy of the age, or the inveteracy of inherited defect, but can estimate the possibilities of moral growth:—

"It is an ever-fixed mark,
Which looks on tempests, but is never shaken;
It is the star to every wandering bark,
Whose worth's unknown, although its height be taken.
—*Lewis Campbell.*

IF any one thinks that it is an easy process to hope in the highest sense, he has yet much to learn of the secrets of his own heart. It is an act, often a difficult act of choice and will, like the highest forms of courage. It is a refusal to be borne down and cowed and depressed by evil; a refusal, because it is not *right*, to indulge in the melancholy pleasure—no unreal one—of looking on the dark side of things. It is so that hope fights with power on the side of God.—*R. W. Church.*

Love.

WE have been accustomed to be told that the greatest thing in the religious world was faith. That has been the keynote for centuries of the evangelical religion; and we have learned to look upon that as the greatest thing in the world. Well, we are wrong. If we have been told that, we have been told wrong. I have taken you in the chapter which I have read to-night (1 Cor. xiii.) to Christianity at its source; and there we have read, "The greatest of these is love." It is not an oversight. Paul was speaking of faith just a moment before. He says, "If I have all faith so that I can remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing." It is not an oversight, and it is not prejudice. A man is apt to recommend to others his own strong point. Love was not Paul's strong point. There is a beautiful tenderness which the observing student can detect as Paul gets old—growing and ripening all through his character; but the hand that wrote "the greatest of these is love," when we meet it first, is stained with blood. Nor is Paul singular in singling out love as the *summum bonum*. The three masters of Christianity are agreed about it. Peter says, "Above all things have fervent love among yourselves." And John goes further, "God is love." And you remember what Christ Himself said about it, "Love is the fulfilling of the law."—*Henry Drummond.*

IT is worthy of remark that while hatred in its energy was, love in its divine greatness was not known and named in profane Greek.—*Cremer.*

THE Old Testament knows of the love of husband to wife: knows of the love of friend to friend, sometimes "passing the love of women;" it knows this devotion as transferred from man to God, throughout the Psalms of David; it knows the love of God Himself towards His peculiar people. Again, the Greek world exhibited the love of friend to friend, and a love which was mere admiration of physical beauty in woman, or intellectual beauty in the language of philosophy. The Alexandrine writers, further, speak much of a love of man to man; but their philanthropy is a mere abstraction to be panegyrised. The "love" of the New Testament retains all the fervour of Hebrew aspiration, and all the personal devotion of Greek to Greek, while it ranges through as wide a sphere as the comprehensive benevolence of Alexandria. With the religious feeling of the Hebrew psalmist in the presence of God, it unites the humanity of the Greek and Alexandrian to man. It is love to man for the sake of love to God; love to God showing itself in man.—*Stanley.*

IT is deeply interesting, and I think profoundly significant, that it is this largest of all kinds and conditions of loving—not the love of wife or child, not the love of friend or brother, not even the love of Christian for Christian—of which it is written, "that it abideth." It seems to say to us that there shall then be a universality and an unboundedness of loving which count nothing and no one alien that God hath created, or for which, conscious or unconscious, receptive or recusant, the Lord Jesus Christ poured out His most precious blood. "In that day there shall be one Lord, and His name one"—"God is love."—*C. J. Vaughan.*

IN Caroline Fox's diary a conversation with Wordsworth is reported, in which the poet owned that he had had some difficulty in accepting St. Paul's exaltation of the grace of charity over faith,—faith which, according to his conception of it, gave man a perception of higher truths than his understanding was capable of arriving at, and elevated him to a loftier region. But the nature of the truths which *Christian* faith at least makes known is such that it is impossible to conceive that grace as separated from love. If these truths have not elevated and drawn out his love both towards God and towards his brethren, he has learned them in vain.—*G. Salmon.*

AMONG the last words of Nitzsch were those, spoken to his old friend Twesten, "I can no longer hear or see or work, I can only love."—*J. Ker: Lectures on Preaching.*

THE Epistle finds its climax in this chapter, as that to the Romans in the conclusion of the eighth chapter, and that to the Hebrews in the eleventh. In this one grace of charity was found the true correction for all the evil tendencies of the Corinthian Church. The Apostle's immediate motive is to show the subordination of gifts of mere display, such as that of tongues; but the style of the passage proves that it rises far above any immediate or local occasion. On each side of this chapter the tumult of argument and remonstrance still rages; but within all is calm: the sentences move in almost rhythmical melody; the imagery unfolds itself in almost dramatic propriety; the language arranges itself with almost rhetorical accuracy. We can imagine how the Apostle's amanuensis must have paused to look up in his master's face at the sudden change in the style of his dictation, and seen his countenance lighted up as it had been the face of an angel, as this vision of divine perfection passed before him.—*Stanley.*

The Epistle to the Romans:

HINTS FOR STUDY.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL ELMER HARDING, M.A., ST. AIDAN'S, BIRKENHEAD.

α. INTRODUCTION.

i. *Farrar:* "Messages of the Books."
Discourse VII. The Form of the Epistles.
Discourse VIII. St. Paul's Thirteen Epistles.
Discourse XIV. The Epistle to the Romans.
ii. *Godet:* "Studies in the Epistles."
Paul's Gospel to the Romans, *Expositor*, 3rd series, vol. iii. pp. 241–259.
General View of St. Paul's Epistles, *Expositor*, 3rd series, vol. viii. pp. 35–47.
iii. *Lightfoot:* Article "Epistle to the Romans," Smith's Bible Dictionary.
iv. *Salmon:* "Introduction to the New Testament." Lecture XX. pp. 392–395.

β. HISTORIES.

i. *Stalker:* Life of St. Paul.
ii. *Iverach:* St. Paul: His Life and Times.
iii. *Conybeare and Howson:* Life and Epistles of St. Paul.
iv. *Farrar:* Life and Work of St. Paul.
v. *Lewin:* Life and Epistles of St. Paul.
vi. *Lechler:* Apostolic and Post Apostolic Times.
vii. *Paley:* Horæ Paulinæ.

γ. COMMENTARIES FOR JUNIOR STUDENTS.

i. *Moule:* Cambridge Bible for Schools.
ii. *Brown:* Handbooks for Bible Classes.
iii. *Sadler:* Church Commentary on New Testament.
iv. *Sanday:* Ellicott's Commentary.
v. *Vaughan:* Greek Text with Notes.

δ. COMMENTARIES FOR MORE ADVANCED STUDENTS.

i. *Beet.*
ii. *Schaff and Riddle:* Clark's English and American Commentary.
iii. *Gifford:* Speaker's Commentary.
iv. *Godet.*
v. *Meyer.*
vi. *Philippi.*
vii. For *Patristic Commentaries v.* Lightfoot's Article in Smith's Bible Dictionary.

ε. EXPOSITIONS.

i. *Dykes:* "Gospel according to St. Paul" (Rom. i.–viii.).
ii. *Farrar:* "Truths to Live by." Part II. According to St. Paul.
1. All have sinned (Rom. iii. 23).
2. We have sinned (Rom. vii. 24).
3. The forgiveness of past sin (Rom. iii. 25).
4. Christ a Ransom and a Propitiation (Rom. iii. 24, 25).
9. St. Paul's Theology, from Faith to Faith (Rom. i. 16, 17).
iii. *Godet:* Logical arrangement of Rom. v. 5–17. *Expositor*, 4th series, vol. i. p. 285.
iv. *Morison:* Expositions of chaps. iii., vi., ix., x.

ζ. OUTLINE FOR STUDY.

i. Personal Matters (i. 1–15).
ii. Dogmatics (i. 16–xi.).
iii. Ethics (xii.–xv. 13).
iv. Personal Matters (xv. 14–xvi. 27).

N.B.—There are two Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans which exist at present only in MS. The authors have been called to their rest. They are the representatives of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. It is to be earnestly hoped that ere long the literature on the Epistle to the Romans will be enriched by the publication of these works. I refer to the Lectures delivered at Oxford by the late Canon Liddon, and to the Lectures delivered at Cambridge by the late Bishop Lightfoot.

Note on The Great Text Commentary.

1 COR. xiii. 12.

ALLOW me to say that I think your expositor has misunderstood the Greek aorist rendered in the Revised Version, "I have been known." He asks to what time the aorist refers. The Greek aorist does not in itself refer to any definite time, but merely asserts that at some time or times in the past, either ages ago or a moment ago, something took place or existed. It thus differs from the English preterite, which always refers either to a definite time or to a time definitely removed from the present. Our language has no aorist or "in-

definite" past tense. The meaning of the Greek tense I discussed at great length in *The Expositor* for March, April, and May 1880. Dr. Weymouth has done the same in the *Theological Monthly* for July and September 1890. Our judgment is practically the same.

The difference between the Greek and English tenses is proved by the frequent impossibility of translating the one by the other, as in the passage before us, Mark x. 20; Matt. xxvi. 65, xxviii. 19, and many others. Oversight of this difference has been a frequent source of confusion in grammatical exposition of the New Testament.

Practically your exposition of the above passage is correct. But the writer's question shows that he does not see the appropriateness of St. Paul's use of the "indefinite" tense.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

[The writer to whom Professor Beet refers is Godet, whose words (given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. ii. p. 135) should be compared with the scholarly note above. But we hope to have a fuller exposition of the subject from Professor Beet.—EDITOR.]

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

NEW DEPARTURE.

HAVING chosen for systematic study—

GENESIS in the Old Testament (the early chapters), and EPHESIANS in the New Testament,

We invite our readers—so many of them as discover the need and the opportunity—to study with us either of these Books or both of them. In the issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1891, two sets of examination papers will be published upon each of these books, four sets in all.

1. The first set of questions will take Dr. Dods' *Commentary on Genesis* as basis (Clark's *Handbooks for Bible Classes*, 2s. 6d.) up to page 27, *together with such papers upon the early chapters of Genesis as appear in* THE EXPOSITORY TIMES *from the December issue* (see Dr. Lumby's introductory paper) *to the issue for May*. No knowledge of Hebrew will be expected.

2. The second set of questions will take Delitzsch's *New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i. (T. & T. Clark, 10s. 6d.) as basis, to the end of p. 204, including the Introduction, and such papers as appear in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, as stated above. An elementary knowledge of Hebrew will be counted upon.

3. The third set of questions will take Moule's *Commentary on Ephesians* (*Cambridge Bible for Colleges*, 2s. 6d.) or Agar Beet's *Ephesians* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1890, 7s. 6d.), including the Introductions and Appendices, together with such papers as appear on Ephesians in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from December to May. No knowledge of Greek will be expected.

4. The fourth set of questions will take as basis either Meyer's *Commentary on Ephesians*, with Introduction and Notes, or the same portion of Ellicott's *Commentary* (Longmans). Some knowledge of Greek will be expected.

Any person may take Nos. 1 and 3, or 2 and 4, but not Nos. 1 and 2, or 3 and 4. The questions may be answered with the free use of these books and papers, or with the assistance of any other books at command. But it will be impossible to answer them well without careful *study* of the portions named.

For the best papers the Publishers will offer books of value, as formerly, those to Nos. 2 and 4 being of more value and of a higher class than those to Nos. 1 and 3.

But, in addition to these, we have proposals to make for more immediate practical work.

Books will be offered *every month*—

1. To the Ministers and Members of some particular Church only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or an Address on any passage occurring in Genesis i.–xi.

2. To all and sundry, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

Accordingly, we offer books this month—

1. To the Ministers and Members of the Baptist Churches only, for the best Notes of a Sermon or Address on any passage in Genesis (Chapters i.–xi.). The Notes must not occupy more than half a column of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, this type. They should be after the nature of the "Methods of Treatment" in the *Great Text Commentary*, *i.e.* readable in themselves.

2. To all, for the best exposition of some word, phrase, sentence, or passage occurring in the Epistle to the Ephesians. No restriction as to length or manner of treatment will be made at present. The original Greek may be referred to or not as convenient.

The best papers will be published every month in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES; and when the writers see them there they may send to the Publishers for the book they select, out of a list which will be given. The number and value of the books will depend upon the success of this scheme of work. The writer's name and address should be given, but no names or initials will be published except of those whose papers are printed, and who do not express a desire to the contrary. The papers intended for May must be received by the Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B., by the 10th day of April, and so on for every succeeding month.

Those whose papers are found in this issue will kindly let the Publishers know which of the following books they wish sent to them:—

Delitzsch's *Iris: Studies in Colour and Talks about Flowers.*
The Voice from the Cross (Ahlfeld, etc.).
Ewald's *Syntax of the Hebrew Language.*
Beck's *Pastoral Theology.*
Monrad's *The World of Prayer.*
Rothe's *Sermons for the Christian Year.*

Exposition of the First Epistle of St. John.

By Professor Richard Rothe, D.D.

CHAPTER II. 8.

"Again, a new commandment write I unto you, which thing is true in Him and in you; because the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth."

The commandment is not merely old; it is likewise at the same time substantially *new* (in Christ). From this point of view, also, John now characterises it. The new commandment is the same as was called the old one in ver. 7; here, however, it is looked at from another side, upon which it appears as a new one. The clause, "which thing is true in Him and in you," refers to the assertion that the commandment of brotherly love is a *new* one. This assertion is *true* in Christ and in the readers—*i.e.* in their consciousness. Both parties, Christ Himself and the reader, have the definite consciousness that it is so. As regards Christ we are assured of this by John xiii. 34, where He gives His commandment of brotherly love expressly as a new one. The Christian also, who receives it from Christ, is conscious that this commandment has become a substantially new one to him, because the two notions, that of brother and that of loving, have become essentially new to us in Christ. In what literal and transcendently high sense we have to call one another brethren, has first become plain to us through the vision of the first-born of many human brethren; and what it is to love a man, we have also first experienced through the vision of the love of Christ, compared with which all other human love must seem impure and languid, yea, unworthy of the name of love. Thus John reminds us that we must not suffer ourselves to be tempted by the assurance of the original antiquity of the ethical demands, which are made upon us in Christ, to take them in a lax sense, and to look upon them as being likely to be easily met. It is true, we are to put upon ourselves only such demands as are in themselves human; but we are to appreciate these, not as they present themselves to the consciousness of the natural man, but as they present themselves to the holy eye of Christ Himself and to the eye of the Christian as enlightened by Him. Accordingly, the statement made above as to the sameness of what is Christian and what is truly human can never tempt us to moral laxity.

"*Because the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shineth.*" This clause may equally well establish the newness of the commandment of brotherly love as make good the assertion that the commandment as Christian is lodged in the consciousness of Christ and the readers as a new one. In point of fact, it establishes the former; for if the darkness is passing away, and the true light is already shining, the primal commandment of love to one's neighbours must naturally also appear in this new illumination as an altogether new one—*i.e.* as one filled with an altogether new and higher content. The *darkness* is the æon of darkness, the whole pre-Christian age and the non-Christian condition of the world, in which, from its very nature, nothing could appear in its true and full light; in which, therefore, nothing, and not even the commandment of love to one's neighbours, could be truly and wholly apprehended. Contrasted with this, the *true light* is Christ Himself (John i. 8, f.), His appearing, which casts upon all things the full and true light in which they are seen, known, and apprehended justly and completely; and this applies especially to the commandment of brotherly love. The clause we are considering describes the character of the whole period in which the Apostle and his readers live. This revolution in the condition of human things brought about in Christ, Paul describes in almost the same words in Romans xiii. 12. It is a fundamental principle with John that the Christian age is related to the non-Christian and pre-Christian as day is to night, and that everything has now come out of the false light into the true. To give utterance to this conviction in John's time required great faith; and it also requires great faith to do so in ours. The darkness is still far from having passed away in the literal sense, and still less had it done so when John wrote. But, he says, it is in the act of passing away; and this is all that the Christian also may say. Whoever should dream that through the light that has risen in Christendom in Christ the darkness has already actually passed away, would very much deceive himself. But, on the other hand, if one should be unwilling to recognise with confidence that the life of Christians is a continuous pushing back of the darkness by the light, he would lose in an equally dangerous way all specifically Christian joyousness and all Christian courage. As to what leads John to this utterance: the darkness is passing away, it cannot be anything else than the deep impression which he has received of Christ as the true light. The human appearance, which was called Jesus, made upon John the impression that through it the

previous gross darkness was broken through, and its might once for all in principle absolutely vanquished. The Christians of those days could feel this better than we now. The Christian, however, is not to allow his conviction that the darkness is passing away to be disturbed by the many experiences he has of the still remaining power of darkness. Nor does he look for the rising of a new light, but for the ever more and more complete piercing of the light that has appeared in Christ through the darkness. Beyond this, there is no new, more specific, revelation of God.

Expository Papers.

Genesis ii. 9: Two Trees in Eden.

(1) *The two trees are amalgamated,* and their qualities confused in heathen myth. The Babylonian cedar of life had the name Ea, god of wisdom in its core, and conferred magic arts, good and evil, on the initiated who tasted its fruit (Sayce, Hibbert Lect. cf. "Hindû Soma").

Confusing the trees, paganism confuses good and evil: the Tempter of Eden became the god of the Gentiles; and the gifts of life were sought from the forbidden tree.

(2) *Two Trees.* In Genesis the two are *distinct.* Adam was permitted to eat of the first till he touched the second. The first was the one thing needful, and contained every good fruit in itself, both wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption (cf. Prov. iii. 18, xi. 30; Sirach xix. 19; Rev. xxii. 2). The second, Sin's fallacious *plus*, was God's *minus.* In a double sense, Satan is the spirit that denies. Disobedience, self-worship, sensualism, atheism lead only to shame and death (James iii. 15). Knowledge itself, when procured at the cost of innocence and reverence, becomes false, worthless, vile, accursed (*Paradise Lost*, Book ix., line 921 *et seq.*).

(3) *Christ is our tree* (John xv. 1), both of life (John vi. 53) and of knowledge (Col. iii. 10). From a seed from the tree of life in Eden sprang the wood of the vēra crux (old legend); by the divine obedience unto death the sons of Adam are redeemed (Rom. v. 12-19), the serpent bruised (Matt. iv. 10), and slain (Heb. ii. 14, 15), and the tree of knowledge healed of its poison (1. Tim. i. 5-7; Gal. v. 19-24). Swedenborg has a beautiful thought: "The tree of life is love, and the faith which springs from love." If this be so, to offend the Love Incarnate, to reject *that* Way, *that* Truth, *that* Life, must be to eat most morbidly of the tree of death.

C. Watt-Smyrk.

Note on Ephesians iii. 18.

The Apostle is often supposed to be referring in this verse, as in the next, to the love of Christ; but the terms used show that he has in his mind the spiritual structure spoken of in chap. ii. 21, 22. Before him is the vision of the Jewish temple on the day of its consecration, when the ark was brought into its place under the wings of the cherubim. Then the glory of the Lord filled the place. Paul desires that the spiritual temple at Ephesus may be so filled with the heavenly light and power and purity as to make manifest His glory, who by His Spirit dwells in their midst. He desires that the magnificent temple of Diana may seem as a thing of nought in comparison with the spiritual glory of the Christian temple. In order to this, the Ephesian Christians need some adequate ideas of the greatness of the divine purpose. Noble conceptions lie at the root of noble living. Many a man's religious life is poor and mean because his religious ideals are so. On the other hand, the soul that has nothing noble in it cannot grasp a noble conception. The Apostle prays, therefore, that in their innermost nature they may be strengthened with might through the Spirit to understand the purpose of God, who is raising this temple for His dwelling-place and the resurrection of His glory. He offers up the prayer to Him who gives according to His own nature, as One who is never impoverished by the largest generosity, that, they may be strong in faith, desire, understanding hope, that thus, grasping the majesty of God's purposes and designs, they may be built up a spiritual temple, vast and beautiful, filled in every part with the glory of God. This, as will be seen, is closely related to, but different from, the desire that they might know the knowledge-surpassing love of Christ. There is here no vain repetition, but a prayer in beautiful harmony with the epistle of which the words, "I speak concerning Christ and the Church," might be taken as the key-note, and in which the Church is spoken of as "Christ's body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all," and by which not only may the glory of God be revealed to men, but His manifold wisdom be made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places.

Edward Spurrier.

Ephesians v. 19: Psalms and Hymns and Spiritual Songs.

The "Psalms" and "Hymns" and "Spiritual Odes" may partake somewhat of redundancy, but as we find them repeated in the kindred Epistle to the Colossians, we may consider that they sum up the whole range of the "Service of Song," and in a measure we may be able to give them a distinctive meaning.

1. The Psalms—lit. songs sung to a stringed instrument—may refer more especially to the Psalter of David, but not exclusively so (*vid.* 1 Cor. xiv. 26). This particular inspiration may, however, have been according to the style of well-known scriptural models.

2. Hymns—lit. songs in praise of Gods and Heroes. These seem in the Christian Church to have been, for the most part, confined to songs of praise in honour of Jesus Christ, or statements of Christian dogma.

3. Songs or Odes—lit. songs of lyric poetry. These varied in metre and shape widely, and were, for the most part, used in a secular sense, hence the addition of spiritual to define them as inspired compositions for a religious purpose.

"Speaking to one another" does not mean the ordinary interchange of thought or carrying on a conversation in the usual manner, but that the oral communications at these particular gatherings (whether for definite worship or not) took the shape indicated in the above expressions. The additional explanatory words in the like passage in Colossians, "teaching and admonishing," helps us to understand the benefit to be gained by this interchange of thought.

"Whenever," it has been well said, "a great quickening of religious life comes, a great burst of Christian song comes with it" (*vid.* "Early Mediæval Song," Luther's and C. Wesley's Hymns). We have here and in other places in St. Paul's writings, also in St. James's, clear indications of the widespread nature of this gift, bursting forth spontaneously, and requiring at times to be checked and controlled; and from the description given by Tertullian, we see that in his days it was still a recognised force in the Christian life. Speaking of what took place at the Agapæ, he says: "Then after water to wash our hands, and lights brought in, every one is moved to sing some hymn to God, either out of Scripture or, as he is able, of his own composing." But the Apostle further adds, the offering of the "Heart Song." It may be that the Christian worshipper is not moved to outward demonstration, but none the less may he share in the spiritual gladness around him, and his heart glow though it be with silent praise; and thus St. Paul shields the voiceless from any disparaging comments, and points out to them a means of joy which they might be in danger of overlooking.

ALFRED GILL.

Index to Modern Sermons and Expositions.

GENESIS.

xlvi.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 420.
Rawlinson (G.), Isaac and Jacob, 158.
xlvi.-l.—Gibson (J. M.), Ages before Moses, 202.
xlvi. 1-4.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 395.
Orelli (C. von.), Old Test. Prophecy, 112.
Spurgeon (C. H.), Sermons, No. 2116.
xlvi. 1-6.—Taylor (W. M.), Joseph the Prime Minister, 137.
xlvi. 1-7.—A1 (1890), 495.
News (1890), 163.
Primitive Methodist World (1890), xv. 415.
Scottish S.S. Teachers' Book, i. 33, ii. 34, iii. 34.
Sunday School Chronicle (1890), xix. 267.
United Meth. F.C. Mag. (1890), lii. 314.
Wesleyan Meth. Mag. (1890), xiv. 242.
xlvi. 1-27.—Candlish (R. S.), Book of Genesis, ii. 231.
xlvi. 2.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 99, 114.
Christian World Pulpit, xxii. 12 (Barfield).
xlvi. 3.—Ewald (H.), Hebrew Grammar, 169.
,, Syntax of the Heb. Lang., 224.
xlvi. 3, 4.—Spurgeon (C. H.), Evening by Evening, 133.
xlvi. 4.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 106.
,, Hebrew Grammar, 212.
,, Syntax of the Heb. Lang., 48, 167.
Wellhausen (J.), History of Israel, 22.
xlvi. 5.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 413.
xlvi. 8-27.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 415, 416.
Kuenen (A.), Hexateuch, 327.
xlvi. 9.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 266, 367, 383.
xlvi. 22.—Ewald (H.), Syntax of the Heb. Lang., 128.
xlvi. 26.—Delitzsch (F.), Biblical Psychology, 132, 138, 240.
Thomson (W. M.), The Land and the Book, 595.
xlvi. 27.—Ewald (H), Syntax, 182, 209.
xlvi. 28.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 77, 407, 413, 417.
Stanley (A. P.), Sinai and Palestine, 35.
S.S. Chronicle (1890), xix. 267.
United Meth. F.C. Mag. (1890), lii. 314.
xlvi. 28-30.—Scottish S.S. Teachers' Book, i. 33, ii. 34, iii. 34.
xlvi. 28-xlvii. 10.—Candlish (R. S.), Book of Genesis, ii. 242.
xlvi. 29, 30.—Parker (J.), People's Bible, i. 356.
xlvi. 34.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 389, 405, 413.
Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, v. 263.
Milman (H. H.), History of the Jews, i. 54.
Homiletic Quarterly, i. 230 (Freeman).
Monthly Interpreter, iv. 22 (Sayce).
xlvii.—Parker (J.), People's Bible, i. 346.
Homiletic Quarterly, iii. 54 (Dickson).
xlvii. 1-4.—Ewald (H.), History, i. 407.
xlvii. 1-10.—Taylor (W. M.), Joseph the Prime Minister, 137.

xlvii. 1–12.—Christian Age, xxxi. 238.
xlvii. 2.—Studies for the Pulpit, i. 124.
xlvii. 3.—Brooks (G.), Outlines of Sermons, 279.
Church of England Mag., xii. 152 (Coates).
Words in Season, 21.
xlvii. 4.—Buttmann (A.), Grammar of N. T. Greek, 59.
xlvii. 5, 6.—Preachers' Lantern, iii. 405 (Hood).
Sermon Bible, i. 172.
xlvii. 6.—Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 407, 415.
Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, i. 495, ii. 2.
xlvii. 7.—Studies for the Pulpit, i. 124.
xlvii. 7–9.—Parker (J.), People's Bible, i. 358.
xlvii. 7–10.—Homiletic Quarterly, iii. 556 (Horton).
xlvii. 7–11.—Kuenen (A.), Hexateuch, 68.
xlvii. 8.—Brooks (G.), Outlines of Sermons, 280.
King (D.), Memoir and Sermons, 265.
Christian Age, xxxi. 36 (Talmage).
Homilist, lii. 102 (Foster).
National Preacher, xxiii. 1 (Smith); xxxiii. 65 (Krebs).
xlvii. 8, 9.—Brown (H. S.), Manliness and other Sermons, 160.
Nicholson (M.), Redeeming the Time, 108.
xlvii. 9.—Binnie (W.), The Psalms, 263.
Brown (J. B.), Sunday Afternoon, 336.
Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 274, 302, 401, 418.
" Syntax, 134.
Farrar (F. W.), Early Days of Christianity, i. 148, 458.
Moorhouse (J.), Jacob: Three Sermons, 69.
Newman (J. H.), Parochial and Plain Sermons, iv. 214.
Oosterzee (J. J. van), Year of Salvation, ii. 377.
Raleigh (A.), Thoughts for the Weary, 241.
xlvii. 9.—Winterbotham (R.), Sermons and Expositions, 36.
Church of England Mag., xxix. 417 (Champneys).
Homiletic Quarterly, iii. 535, iii. 553 (Joscelyne).
Homilist, xlix. 408.
Sermon Bible, i. 173, 174.
Sunday Magazine (1882), 799 (Jones).
xlvii. 10.—Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, ii. 3.
Taylor (W. M.), Joseph the Prime Minister, 137.
xlvii. 11.—Ewald (H.), History, i. 407, 412.
Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, ii. 2.
xlvii. 11–28.—Candlish (R. S.), Book of Genesis, ii. 254.
xlvii. 13–26.—Dods (M.), Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, 209.
Ewald (H.), History of Israel, i. 414.
Taylor (W. M.), Joseph the Prime Minister, 91.
xlvii. 15.—Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, ii. 3.
xlvii. 16.—Geikie (C.), Life and Words of Christ, i. 586.
xlvii. 17.—Presbyterian Review (1885), vi. 321.
xlvii. 17, 18.—Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, i. 359, 495.
xlvii. 21.—Ewald (H.), Hebrew Grammar, 211; Syntax, 159.
Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, i. 483.
xlvii. 22.—Lenormant (F.), Ancient History of the East, i. 291.
xlvii. 23.—Kitto (J.), Daily Bible Illustrations, i. 212.
xlvii. 24.—Ewald (H.), Syntax, 130.
xlvii. 27.—Taylor (W. M.), Joseph the Prime Minister, 153.
xlvii. 27–31.—Macduff (J. R.), Sunsets on the Hebrew Mountains, 23.
xlvii. 29.—Geikie (C.), Hours with the Bible, i. 406.
xlvii. 29–31.—Candlish (R. S.), Discourses on Genesis, ii. 259.

The Religious Literature of the Month.

BOOKS.

A large number of theological books have been issued in the course of the month, and some of them are of first-rate importance.

Messrs. James Nisbet & Co. have sent out in handsome form an **Introduction to the Johannine Writings,** by Dr. Paton J. Gloag (8vo, 440 pp., 10s. 6d.); and a new edition of the late Dean Goode's Warburtonian Lectures, **Fulfilled Prophecy a Proof of the Truth of Revealed Religion,** edited by Dr. Bullinger (8vo, 240 pp., 7s. 6d.).

Messrs. Longmans have issued a volume of sermons by the late Canon Liddon, under the title **Passion-tide Sermons.** They have been delivered for the most part on Passion Sunday in various years since 1871 (crown 8vo, 300 pp., 5s.). The same publishers send **The Battle of Belief,** a Book of Evidences for the Times, by Nevison Loraine (crown 8vo, 234 pp., 5s.).

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published a new and much enlarged edition of **Riehm's Messianic Prophecies,** translated by Mr. Lewis Muirhead, with a delightful Introduction by Professor A. B. Davidson (post 8vo, 348 pp., 7s. 6d.). Also a handsome volume by Otto Funcke, under the title of **The World of Faith and the Everyday World** as Displayed in the Footsteps of Abraham, translated by Sophia Taylor (post 8vo, 354 pp., 7s. 6d.). The same publishers have also issued **Pre-organic Philosophy and the Biblical Idea of God,** by Charles Chapman, M.A., LL.D., Principal of Western College, Plymouth (crown 8vo, 304 pp., 6s.); and two Delitzsch books, namely, **Messianic Prophecies in Historical Succession,** by Franz Delitzsch, translated by Professor Samuel Ives Curtiss (crown 8vo, 232 pp., 5s.), and **Franz Delitzsch:** A Memorial Tribute, by Professor Curtiss, with portrait (crown 8vo, 96 pp., 3s.).

Messrs. Macmillan and Mr. R. D. Dickinson have simultaneously published editions of Dr. Phillips Brooks' new volume of sermons, **The Light of the World,** the former at 3s. 6d. (crown 8vo, 373 pp.) and the latter at 4s. 6d. (crown 8vo, 416 pp.). Mr. Dickinson sends also **The Romance of Religious Begging,** by Charles Leach, D.D. (crown 8vo, 152 pp., 1s.).

From the Cambridge University Press there comes another volume of the **Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools,** being 1 Kings by Professor Rawson Lumby (144 pp., 1s.).

We have also received this month **The Great Day of the Lord,** by the Rev. Alexander Brown, which is published by Hamilton, Adams, & Co. (crown 8vo, 259 pp., 3s. 6d.).

MAGAZINES.

The Contemporary Review (Isbister, 2s. 6d.) has several articles of interest, such as Farrar's "John Wesley," Francis Peek's "The Eclipse of Justice," Wenley's "Pessimism as a System," and Richard Heath on the "Anabaptists." The point of the last-named article is in this sentence: "No one can thoroughly examine the matter and avoid the conclusion that the Baptists and the Quakers are to the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century what the Howards and the Stanleys are to the historic families whose names they bear." But the best thing in the Review is Professor Herford's translation of a scene from Ibsen's drama, *Brand*. A line or two will give some idea of the language, but to feel the power one must read the whole scene—

> "Only by sacrifice the soul
> Achieves redemption from the dust;
> Hard truth, our age appalled descries,
> And therefore stubbornly denies.
> To pray? Ah, pray—a word that slips
> So easily from all men's lips;
> A coin by all men lightly paid.
> What's prayer? In storm and stress to shout
> Unto the vague Unknown for aid,
> Upon Christ's shoulders beg a place,
> And stretch both hands to heaven for grace
> While knee-deep in the slough of Doubt.
> Ha! if there needed nothing more,
> I might, like others, dare to raise
> My hand and batter at His door
> Who still is 'terrible in praise.'
> And yet in uttermost despair,
> In shuddering sorrow's deepest deep,
> When Alf at last had sunk to sleep,
> And all his mother's kisses vain
> Won not the lost smile back again—
> What felt I—if it was not prayer?
> Whence came that trance, that ecstasy,
> That rushing music, like a blast,
> That sang afar and hurried past,
> Bore me aloft, and set me free?
> Was it the ecstasy of prayer?
> Did I with God hold converse there?"

"I think," says Agnes Repplier in the **Atlantic Monthly** (Ward, Lock, & Co., 1s.), "I think the most beautiful figure in recent literature is Mr. Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*, whose life, regarded from the outside, is but a succession of imperfect results, yet who, deserted and dying, counts over with a patient and glad heart the joys he has been permitted to know. 'Like a child thinking over the toys it loves, one after another, that it may fall asleep so, and the sooner forget all about them, he would try to fix his mind, as it were impassively, on all the persons he had loved in life,—on his love for them, dead or living, grateful for his love or not, rather than on theirs for him,—letting their images pass away again, or rest with him, as they would. One after another he suffered these faces and voices to come and go, as in some mechanical exercise; as he might have repeated all the verses he knew by heart, or like the telling of beads, one by one, with many a sleepy nod between whiles.'"

The Missionary Review of the World (Funk & Wagnalls, 1s.), recently greatly improved, is now a most interesting magazine from beginning to end, and has no rival in its line. Out of many excellent articles in the March number may be selected for mention an account of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, held by a sect of Japanese Buddhists. The sect takes the name of Shin-Shin from its founder Shinran, who is called the Luther of Buddhism. The Shin-Shin sect has the following points of belief in its creed:—1. Salvation is due to faith only in the power and willingness of Amita to save mankind. 2. This salvation is received at once, not at death. 3. Morality is of equal importance with faith. 4. While Nirvana, or eternal happiness, is to be attained (as all Buddhists teach) by the extinction of the passions through many deaths and re-births, yet this extinction of passions may be reached through help from another (contrary to the usual Buddhist teaching), that is, from Amitabha, he being the chief of the Buddhas. The name Amitabha signifies "boundless life" or "immeasurable light."

In the **Old and New Testament Student** (Trübner, 7s. 6d. per annum), Professor Harper writes clearly and forcibly in favour of the "historical" method of interpreting the Bible. "Let it be regarded as self-evident that any Scripture was intended, first of all, for the particular time and occasion when it was first put forth by word of mouth or in written form; that the interpreter's first duty must be to find out the meaning and purpose of the message at that particular time and occasion; and that only when this fundamental task has been accomplished is it safe to employ that Scripture for devotional, hortatory, or doctrinal purposes." "Such a method," he adds, "is fundamental in solving contradictions, discovering complementary truths, and revealing the substance of much biblical teaching before concealed in its temporal forms." For "the Bible is not so simple a book to understand and interpret as many think. It is an excellent thing to give the Bible to the people, to put it into the hands of every one. But this is no assurance that every one will be able to comprehend or teach it. We wish that the words of Professor W. A. Stevens, in an article contributed to this journal, might have careful attention:—'It is a mistake fraught with serious intellectual and spiritual consequences to imagine the Bible, or indeed any single book of it, easy of comprehension. It is a book written by men of a different race from ourselves, in a foreign language, and in a distant age; a book which expounds on broad lines the historic process of redemption, which came slowly to completion through a period of sixteen centuries, which enshrines the profoundest experiences and the loftiest conceptions known to the soul of man.'"

Professor Workman's article on "Messianic Prophecy" in the **Canadian Methodist Quarterly** (Toronto, 30 cents) has called forth many protests, as was inevitable. The number for January contains two formal replies, neither quite conclusive. The truth is, there is too much reliance upon weapons which have long since lost their edge, if they ever had one, such as Rollin's *Ancient History*. Nor have the editors been frightened back into traditional ways, for

in this same number is an article which gives the narrative of the Deluge according to the Elohist and the Jehovist in parallel columns, and asks if it is reasonable to suppose that Moses "mixed up the two." Professor Harper's suggestions for systematic Bible study in Sunday schools is the most useful thing in the whole review, but it is all readable and well worthy of attention. There is one puzzling thing only,—why such forms as Welhausen, Blakie, Kurz, Deutch, Mechizedek?

There are three great evidences for Christianity, says the Bishop of Liverpool, in the **Churchman's Magazine** (Kensit, 1d.), three great broad facts which never can be explained away: (1) Jesus Christ Himself; (2) The Bible itself; and (3) the effect which Christianity has produced in the world. Take up your position boldly behind the ramparts of these three facts, and you may safely defy the utmost efforts of sceptics. The difficulties of Christianity no doubt are great, but they are nothing compared to the *difficulties of infidelity*.

In the **Scottish Congregationalist** (Edinburgh), Mr. A. E. Garvie, M.A. of Mansfield College, contrasts the mediæval and the modern conceptions of Christian life. His mediæval authority is the *Imitatio*, and he finds it antiquated (at least from the *ideal* of modern Christianity) in two particulars. 1. "When we read, as we do read, his complaints that he loves the creature more than the Creator, his entreaties that the love of man may become naught to him, and the love of God all, we feel that here is a mood that we do not wish either to understand or to experience." 2. "The monk gives us the individual conception of the Christian life, which has so hindered the realisation of the Christian ideal, which is, as the life of Christ shows, social."

The Saturday Review of March 7 (London, 6d.) has something to say on this latter point in an article on "John Wesley." "Both Wesley and Newman were wrecked by their excessive individualism in religion, though both had the excuse that in their days the impersonal view of religion had turned to something like personal irreligion. Both were egotists, and taught egotism in religious matters. Neither seems to have observed that in the central formula of the Christian faith 'I' occurs only in the phrase 'I believe'; 'Thy,' 'Me,' 'Mine,' nowhere. They were not content to accept the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the Forgiveness of Sins, the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life everlasting. They must have the Church which satisfies and sanctifies *me, my* private membership in the Communion, the forgiveness of *my* sins, the resurrection of *my* body, the life everlasting made sure by patent to *me*." Comment does not seem necessary.

The Review of Reviews, an advance copy, is just received. With each issue the "reviews" are less and the original contributions more. This, which was inevitable, is most acceptable. There has been no more interesting number than the present.

The Religious Review of Reviews is improving, but it has not yet got within cry of the other.

NOTABLE SERMONS AND EXPOSITIONS IN MARCH.

Gen. i. 1 (Watson), Preacher's Magazine.
xxv. 8 (Gunsaulas), Evangelical Magazine.
Exod. xiv. 3, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2188.
xxxiv. 29 (Maclaren), Homiletic Review.
Lev. vii. 1 (Parker), Christian Commonwealth, 490.
Josh. vi. 20 (Eastwood), Quiver.
xxiv. 15, Original Secession Magazine.
2 Sam. vii. 18–29 (Moule), King's Own.
1 Kings iv. 33 (Gregory), Wesleyan Meth. S.S. Magazine.
2 Kings v. 10 (Bullock), Hand and Heart.
1 Chron. iv. 9, 10 (Fullerton), Footsteps of Truth.
Ps. xix. 12 (Thorold), Good Words.
xxxii. 8, 9, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2190.
xxxvii. 3 (Crozier), Church of Eng. Pulpit, 793.
lx. 5 (Stuart), Churchman's Magazine.
lxxxi. 10 (Monti), Word and Work, 833.
lxxxii. 17, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2187.
lxxxviii. 18 (Pearse), Preacher's Magazine.
xcv. 7, 8, Young Men's Christian Magazine.
cxv. 1 (Kelly), Methodist Recorder, 1733.
cxix. 96 (Tipple), Sunday Magazine.
cxxxix. (Chambers), Homiletic Review.
Cant. v. 16 (Spurgeon), Sword and Trowel.
Isa. liii. 1 (Parker), Christian Commonwealth, 489.
lxii. 6, 7, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2189.
Ezek. xxxiii. 7–9 (Leech), Homiletic Review.
Zech. xii. 10 (Body), Church Bells, 1054; Church Times, 1467.
Matt. i. 21 (Spurgeon), Christian Herald, 8.
v. 3 (Carroll), Christian Leader, 479.
xxiv. 12 (Macmillan), Life and Work.
xxvi. 36 (Petavel), Expositor.
Luke ix. 61 (Hamlin), New York Evangelist, 3179.
xix. 5, Sunday at Home.
xxiii. 27–29 (Body), Church Bells, 1053; Church Times, 1466.
John i. 43–46 (Bannerman), F.C. of Scotland Monthly.
vi. 14 (Carpenter), Mag. of Christian Literature.
viii. 1 (Meyer), Christian, 1101.
viii. 31, 32 (Brooks), American Churchman, 2405.
xv. 11, Primitive Methodist Magazine.
xx. 29 (Bowman), Homiletic Review.
Acts ii. 4 (Wright), Theological Monthly.
viii. 30, Sunday at Home.
x. 30, 31 (Hole), Church Bells, 1054.
xvi. 30, 31 (Birch), Christian Million, 386.
Rom. v. 8 (Calthrop), Fireside Magazine.
xvi. 7 (Thorold), Sunday Magazine.
1 Cor. i. 1 (Randolph), American Churchman, 2403.
vii. 29–31, Record, 7601.
xv. 20 (Cowell), Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.
2 Cor. iii. 18 (Swaine), Baptist Magazine.
Gal. i. 15–17 (Dale), Methodist Recorder, 1733.
vi. 14, Primitive Methodist Magazine.
Eph. vi. 15 (Everard), Quiver.
Phil. iii. 13, 14 (Moulton), Methodist Recorder, 1733.
Heb. v. 9 (Edwards), British Weekly, 226.
xii. 1, 2 (Dallinger), Preacher's Magazine.
xiii. 21 (Maclaren), Freeman, 1882.
James i. 9, 10 (Cox), Expositor.
Rev. i. 5, 6 (Birch), Christian Million, 385.
ii. 5 (Hole), Church Bells, 1053.
ii. 12–17 (Urquhart), King's Own.
xx. 4–6 (Murphy), Presbyterian Churchman.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June will contain a reply to Professor Graetz's recent article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, on the "Origin and Date of the Septuagint," by the Rev. H. B. Swete, D.D., Bishop Westcott's successor as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Professor Ryle's second paper will also appear next month.

We publish to-day Professor Davison's recent address upon Inspiration and Biblical Criticism. It has received much attention, and it is very noteworthy, both because it is the work of one of our ripest and most trustworthy scholars, and because, as the *Rock* expresses it, "the paper is not the case of one man taking up a position in advance of the other members of his communion, but simply a barometric indication of the position which had already been assumed by the principal Methodist thinkers." Professor Davison has carefully revised and corrected the paper for THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

We may be permitted further to invite the attention of our more scholarly readers to Principal M'Clellan's article upon the reading "daily bread" in the Lord's Prayer. They who use his important volume on the Four Gospels will understand that he is well equipped for so difficult an investigation, and they will know not to look for anything that would have even the remotest tendency towards impairing the authority and spirituality of Scripture. It was largely expected that the Revisers would change the translation of the difficult Greek word in question, but they went no further than to suggest an alternative rendering in the margin. Their attitude was due to the powerful influence of the late Bishop Lightfoot, who was then considered practically to have settled the point in favour of the authorised rendering by his elaborate essay on the word "daily" in the volume *On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, issued just before the Revisers began to sit.

By the death of Dr. Howard Crosby, the *Homiletic Review* loses one of its most original contributors. Always interesting, because independent, his short expository papers have often been stimulating and instructive, and we shall miss them not a little. In front of the oldest and stiffest exegetical problems, he manifested a courageous hopefulness which invigorated one like a fresh northern breeze. There is an instance in the very latest issue of the *Homiletic Review*. The subject is the sun and the moon standing still (Josh. x. 12–14). Calling to his aid the new science of biblical archæology as well as the old science of Hebrew lexicography, he comes to the conclusion that the miracle did not consist in the standing still of the sun and of the moon for a whole day, thus adding a day as it were to the calendar, but in their abiding steadfast in the heavens for some period (say, two or three hours) of the day in sight of the army of Israel, an effect which he thinks God may have accomplished by making use of the laws of refraction. Then, when the purpose was accomplished of giving the army a token that they would gain the victory, the refraction ceased, and the heavenly bodies returned to

their rightful places. The current conception of the miracle is that the day was nearly done, and Joshua in his zeal craved the continuance of the light that he might see to rout the enemy. But Dr. Crosby believes that the miracle took place in the morning. The recently identified sites of Ajalon and Gibeon make that, he thinks, certain. And as for the wording of the narrative, the only obstacle lies in the thirteenth verse, which he would prefer to translate "hasted not to go down as a perfect day" rather than "hasted not to go down about a whole day."

Who was Melchizedek? Dr. John Henry Hopkins tells us, in the *American Church Review* for January (New York, 4s.), that he has had it in mind for a long time to write a book which should answer that question. But it is only one of several books which have been waiting to be born, some of them for more than forty years, and, life having become too short in the prospect, for such a parentage, Dr. Hopkins selects fifteen of them, and presents their titles and leading ideas as probably his last contribution to the literature of the Church. "Who was Melchizedek?" is the title of one of these "unwritten books."

The late Dean of Wells made us familiar with the "ideal" biography, and charming they were to read and think about. But as Dr. Spence truly says in the current issue of *Good Words*, they were "somewhat untrustworthy." A biography of Melchizedek, which should fill a volume, seeing that all our knowledge of him is contained in three verses of the book of Genesis, a verse of the 110th Psalm, and four verses of the Epistle to the Hebrews, must have been surely, if it had been written, an addition to Dr. Plumptre's "ideal" library, and somewhat untrustworthy. We can well believe, however, that it would have been pleasant to read, for that and more can be said of the five-and-a-half pages which its leading ideas fill in the *Church Review*.

Before offering a new interpretation of a passage, one should show that the old is untenable. Dr. Hopkins remembers this. If we consult the general run of commentaries, he says, we find that Melchizedek was a petty Canaanitish prince, who had preserved the faith in the true and only God in the midst of a number of other nations, all of whom were Pagans and idolaters of the worst description; and that this Melchizedek was a priest of the Most High God as well as a king; also that the seat of his kingdom was Salem, afterwards known as Jerusalem. When we are told of him that he was without father, without mother, without descent (or genealogy), without beginning of days or end of life, the explanation given us of these words is, that no record is found of the name of his father or mother or ancestors, or of his birth or death. Yet we are required to believe that this petty ruler of a petty Canaanitish town, this Gentile of unknown genealogy, was spiritually so superior to Abraham, the friend of God and father of the faithful, that Abraham paid him the tithes in acknowledgment of his nearer approach to God, and received the blessing as the less is blessed of the better. Dr. Hopkins' short and emphatic comment is, "It is impossible!"

Who, then, *was* Melchizedek? Dr. Hopkins examines the Scripture evidence, making his way from the Epistle to the Hebrews back to Genesis. "Abideth a priest continually"—how are we to understand this? Can we say that "abideth a priest continually" means that he died within a few years at the most, and that there was no other priest of his order until Christ was born, nearly two thousand years after? Again, "Here men that die receive tithes; but there he receiveth them of whom it is witnessed that he *liveth*." Can that mean that Melchizedek died just like the others? Moreover, Christ, who is after the similitude of Melchizedek, is also *after the power of an endless life*. Where is the "similitude of Melchizedek" if he too was not after the power of an *endless* life? Is this not the point of the reference in the 110th Psalm? "Thou art a priest *forever*, after the order of Melchizedek." And thus returning to Genesis, Dr. Hopkins points out that there is no evidence of the existence of any town or city or kingdom, in Abraham's time, in all Palestine, that was true to the worship of Jehovah. To Abraham and to his seed God promises the whole land as a possession, "from the river of Egypt unto the great river

the river Euphrates." If there was a nation or even a city within it with a king spiritually so superior to Abraham, "can we for a moment suppose that God would have lumped them in with the most heathen in the world?" And where was this Salem? Where later Jerusalem stood? Abraham passed and repassed near the site of Jerusalem, but we never read of his meeting Melchizedek again. It was on Mount Moriah, within a few furlongs of Melchizedek's supposed residence, that Abraham offered up Isaac. Where was this priestly superior then when such a sacrifice was being laid upon the altar?

"This Melchizedek, King of Salem, Priest of the Most High God, . . . first being by interpretation King of Righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is King of Peace"—Dr. Hopkins believes that he was none other than the Son of God Himself, who appeared to Abraham in that visible form in which He afterwards dwelt among us in the flesh. He holds that only with this interpretation can Scripture be brought into harmony. He who was a priest to Abraham was "a priest forever" according to the Psalmist, He alone has "the power of an endless life" of the Epistle to the Hebrews. And this, therefore, he thinks, was the occasion referred to when Christ said to the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad."

Dr. Hopkins seeks to strengthen his interpretations by a number of interesting particulars. The word translated "order" is in the Hebrew a derivative of דָּבָר (*dabar*), which is the precise equivalent for the Greek λόγος (*logos*), the Word, "whose profound depth of signification is given to us in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel." And the *i*, which is found at the end of the Hebrew word, he believes to be the pronominal suffix *my*. The same suffix occurs in the word Melchizedek itself. Of that name the first part, *Melch*, means king, and *zedek*, righteousness; and if the *i* means *my*, then the whole verse of this Psalm cx. would run literally, "Thou art a priest forever according to My Word of My King of Righteousness." "What," he asks, "becomes of the petty Canaanitish princeling on this understanding?"

Now it may be admitted that that translation of Psalm cx. 4 is grammatically possible. As respects the principal phrase, competent translators, like Herder and Geiger, have already so rendered it, though the meaning which they find in it is very different from that of Dr. Hopkins. It is grammatically possible, but both the usage of language and the authority of the versions are against it, and it is therefore in too great need of support itself to be set as a support to something else. Will Dr. Hopkins' identification of Melchizedek with the pre-incarnate Son of God stand alone then? We do not think so. Much as there seems to be in its favour, there is also much against it. In particular, there is one serious objection to it which careful students of the theology of the Old Testament will best appreciate. Let us give it on the testimony of Delitzsch.

There has recently been published in Germany a series of letters which passed between Delitzsch and Hofmann when they were together in Erlangen, and the editor of the *Expositor* has translated a few of them for his April number. The few translated deal with the descent of Christ into Hades. Hofmann refuses to attach any great weight to that clause of the creed, if he even believes it true in the popular sense at all. Delitzsch, on the other hand, not only finds evidence in Scripture for the Descent, but holds that it is an important link in the great work of redemption. He relies, however,—indeed Hofmann drives him into relying,—upon his own interpretation of the greatly debated passage (1 Peter iii. 19) respecting the spirits in prison. The most interesting letter in the series is Delitzsch's last. There he attacks the interpretation of that passage which makes it refer to a message of Christ during the 120 years of grace to the generation of the Flood. His objection is a forcible one, and it applies with even more force to the identification of Melchizedek with the Son of God. "Preaching," he says, "is a personal action. But Jesus Christ is pre-existent in Old Testament history only in Jehovah the God of redemption, whose purpose it is to become Incarnate, and in the angel of Jehovah, who, as a manifestation of God, is Himself a pre-revelation of the Incarnation. This is the explanation of such sayings as that Isaiah saw Jesus Christ (chap. vi.);

that the spirit of Christ was in the prophets; that Moses chose the shame of Christ rather than the treasures of Egypt; that Christ was the rock which followed Israel." And he adds, "*You and I agree that Christ was not otherwise pre-existent in Old Testament history than in Jehovah*, who had the Incarnation already in view." This position, which is well founded, whatever may be its bearing upon the passage in 1 Peter, is fatal to Dr. Hopkins' interpretation of the passages which deal with Melchizedek.

Having touched upon the 110th Psalm, it is impossible to pass away from it without some reference to recent exposition, and to the place it occupies in that question which is now so keenly debated amongst us. Its place in that controversy is quite unique. It is the 110th Psalm and our Lord's words in reference to it that have caused many an one not merely to hesitate in front of the claims of the Historical Criticism, but absolutely to refuse to look at these claims or the grounds upon which they are made. We have just received Archdeacon Denison's speech in Convocation last February, on *Lux Mundi* (Longmans 1891, 6d.). What strength it has rests upon its appeal to Christ's use of the Old Testament, the Appendix of our Lord's quotations from the Old Testament being scarcely needed to show this. But Archdeacon Denison's speech is not comparable for power and persuasiveness to a speech delivered by Archdeacon Perowne at the late Islington Conference, and reported fully in the *Record*. And again, its almost irresistible appeal finds its climax in Christ's quotation of the 110th Psalm. That quotation, and the argument founded upon it, seems to Dr. Perowne to leave no opening whatever to any criticism of the authorship of the psalm in its direct Messianic application.

What, then, does recent criticism say of the 110th Psalm? Take three typical examples. Kuenen admits no complete Davidic psalms in the Psalter. There may be Davidic passages in some of the Psalms of the first and second books, but he is convinced that the three last books contain nothing whatever by David. Any one who looks at the Revised Version will see that Psalm cx. belongs to Book V., and therefore it is in Kuenen's judgment wholly non-Davidic, the product most probably of the post-exilic period.

Let Orelli be heard next, as the representative of a more conservative criticism. Following Ewald, Orelli attributes Psalm cx. to the time of David, but not to David himself; probably to Nathan the prophet. He cannot believe that David was himself the author, because the words of the Psalm are directly addressed to a second person who is described as both priest and king. This person must, in the first reference, have been the then reigning monarch; there is no other instance, and he will not allow that this is an instance, in which the Messiah is referred to first and last, singled out at once and made definite and personal before the writer's mind. "We cannot persuade ourselves," these are his words, "to consider David as the prophet speaking, because in that view another higher ruler would be addressed by him—namely, the perfect Messiah to come. Such a conscious distinction between his own person and the true Messiah, to whom David was so constantly subject that he could call him his lord, finds no sufficient support either in 2 Samuel xxiii. or in any other psalm" (*Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 154).

Now turn to Delitzsch. In his just published *Messianic Prophecies* (p. 90), Delitzsch not only accepts Psalm cx. as written by David, but finds no difficulty in believing that its reference is immediately and directly to the future Messiah. "The New Testament Scriptures presuppose that David speaks in this psalm of another rather than of himself, that, as if he had descended from his throne, he bows himself before the One who is at the same time his Son and his Lord, and that therefore, so to speak, the type lays his crown at the feet of the antitype; *and we know no counter proofs which compel us to correct this view of the psalm*, with which the argument of the Lord (Mark xii. 35–37, and parallels) stands or falls as untrue, or only indirectly true." Such is Delitzsch's final judgment, the judgment of a higher critic. It may not be the final judgment of all criticism; but even if it were a solitary opinion, which it is not, it will always carry the weight of a great name, and it may well give confidence for many a day to those who cannot investigate the problem for themselves.

Inspiration and Biblical Criticism.[1]

By Rev. Professor Davison, M.A., Richmond.

How far is the doctrine of Inspiration and the Divine authority of Holy Scripture affected by modern Biblical Criticism? Are the ascertained results, not the theories and hypotheses, of a valid, not of a fanciful and speculative criticism, such as to make it necessary in any degree to modify traditional views of the Bible as the Word of God? And if so, how far, within what limits, according to what principles, is such modification to be admitted?

That there is ground for such an inquiry cannot, I think, be denied. A revolution is taking place in the history of theology, and the Bible cannot but be affected by it. Not only are men's views and opinion changing, but their very standpoint is so rapidly being altered that men with twenty-five or fifty years between them hardly understand one another's language or mental attitude. The advance of scientific knowledge, of historical, geographical, archæological discovery; the establishment of the science of textual criticism; the labour and concentrated attention bestowed upon biblical literature—these and other causes have almost metamorphosed Bible study, so that the commentators of half a century ago have become in some respects antiquated, and problems press upon the reverent student of to-day of which our fathers knew and might be content to know little or nothing. Two facts only I name to establish the proposition that there is ground for inquiry: The publication of the biblical articles in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and the fact that *Lux Mundi* is in its eleventh edition, mainly because of the essay on Inspiration.

If it be answered, as well it may, that all these things do not concern the simple Christian who reverently reads his Bible to find the way to heaven, and that ministers will do well to make that the main factor in their consideration of this matter, the reply at once must be, Perfectly true: it cannot be too strongly insisted on. That is the first truth in this investigation of ours concerning the Bible, and it will be the last; about that there is no controversy. But it must be added that in this, as in all else, the minister must lead his people, and to this end must have his own ideas clear on a number of questions he does not bring directly before them; that, further, a large proportion of his most intelligent hearers keenly feel a number of the difficulties I have hinted at, and if the minister does not know precisely where he stands in this matter, he will not be a leader at all, or only the blind leader of the blind, both falling into the ditch. There is abundant proof to-day that leadership is needed; men are crying out for it, and many ministers are only regretting their inability to give it as they would.

You do not expect me to lay down any dogma or formulary on this subject. There is none such. In the undivided Church of the early centuries, the Anglican Church, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church, there is a notable absence of definition as to the exact doctrine of Inspiration, as if the Church had been guided by the Spirit of God to abstain from formulating theories which might prove to be untenable. Neither do you expect from me a personal confession of faith which could be of no importance to any one but myself, useful here only as a mark for subsequent speakers to practise shooting at. But I understand that I am asked to offer some suggestions as to the present state of opinion upon a subject as to which even such a writer as Professor Banks states that additional light and leading are not only "desirable" but "necessary." Respectfully, therefore, I ask that my desultory remarks shall be judged as only of the nature of suggestions from one who has pondered, according to opportunity, this most important, most difficult, and, just now, burning question.

The present position, then, seems to be something like this: An ecclesiastical doctrine of Inspiration, of greater or less antiquity, has been in possession of the field among orthodox evangelical Churches, according to which the Bible has been viewed as a compact whole, from end to end the words of God, every part of it Divine in the same sense, infallible in every detail, inspired in every word, accepted as the sole authority on all questions, established in its place as the ultimate arbiter on the evidence of miracles and prophecy, acknowledged as such almost without question by all teachers and members of these Churches. Now, there is an uneasy feeling that this elaborate structure is more or less undermined. It stands erect, apparently uninjured, but there has been much digging and investigation going on at the foundations beneath, so much sapping and mining on the part of what is known as criticism, that it appears as if at any moment a collapse might come and the authority of the sacred Scriptures be shaken to its very base. "What are we to say?"

*

[1] A Paper read at the London Wesleyan Ministers' Meeting, 16th March 1891.

I have been asked again and again by ministers and intelligent laymen, What is the worth and strength of this criticism, and how is the doctrine of Inspiration affected by it?

Is there any inconsistency between an unhesitating belief in the Inspiration of Scripture, so that it may be reverenced as the Divine Word, an authoritative revelation, the ultimate arbiter of faith and practice, and a reasonable and valid biblical criticism, searching into all possible questions concerning the Books of the Bible? I am strongly persuaded there is no such inconsistency, but much depends on the way in which the subject of Inspiration is approached. Now, I should answer, the doctrine of Inspiration is the very last thing we come to in a time of searching inquiry and unsettlement of foundations. It is not wise to begin with that, and make the authority of the Book the basal tenet of faith. All are agreed that the Bible is Divine and human, pervaded by the influence of the Divine Spirit as is no other volume or volumes, yet human literature, composed and handed down under the conditions of ordinary literature. The theory of Inspiration concerns the precise relation between these, the character and degree of influence exercised by the Divine Spirit over the minds of human writers. We must not begin with that—we cannot. We cannot if we would, and we should not if we could. The question whether the Bible is or contains the Word of God; whether Inspiration be verbal, plenary, dynamic, may be very important: though, so far as I have watched such controversies, they seem too often to degenerate into mere strifes of words.

Far better begin with that which gives to this collection of books its unity, its character, its vitality, its authority, viz. the fact that it contains the record of the Revelation of the Living God—a series of revelations rather, culminating in the one consummate manifestation of God the Father in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. A long and multifarious record is given us in these books unfolding God's nature, His dealings with man, all within certain limits and for certain ends, but mainly for man's practical guidance and personal salvation; this revelation claiming to be itself supernatural, unique, complete, and all-sufficient for those purposes for which it was given. Inspiration is the name given to the special influence exercised by the Spirit of God in the preparation of that record, and it is clear that it is possible to adopt

1. Too low a view of that influence, not sufficiently recognising the sacredness of the substance;
2. Too high a view, which in its anxiety to preserve that sacredness propounds an untenable doctrine that defeats its own end.

But if we want to get at a satisfactory doctrine, we must not begin with that subject or at that end. It is not well to say "Inspiration *must* imply this or that." Butler has shown how dangerous it is to argue thus, how prone man is to degrade the Divine by endeavouring to exalt it according to his own ideas. We must argue not deductively and *à priori*, but *à posteriori* and inductively. Some may be afraid of so doing lest old landmarks should be lightly removed. On this subject let me quote Dr. Pope: "The Bible is a Divine-human collection of books, the precise relation of human and Divine in which is a problem which has engaged much attention, and has not yet been, though it may be, adequately solved. The Holy Ghost never defines inspiration as applied to the whole body of Scripture; we have to construct our theory from the facts, and our theory must face those undisputable facts as it finds them" (*Comp. Theol.* i. 175, 191).

But in these days we cannot begin so. Criticism is at work, and must neither be ignored or defied. How foolish, how wrong to do either! Criticism means examination; will not the Bible bear examination? Suspicion of criticism may be godly jealousy, but it may mean mere prejudice, an unwillingness to face facts. What we have to be jealous of is a criticism with tacit assumptions concerning the supernatural—criticism only in name, because it hides in its premisses the statements which it afterwards triumphantly produces in its conclusions. There must be the greatest care as to the assumptions of this criticism, its methods, its canons, its hypotheses. An unsound criticism must be met, not by denunciation, but by sound and sober criticism. What is the reason why so much criticism is rationalistic, so that the very name bears with some an ill savour? I fear largely because Rationalism has done so much more minute and thorough work of investigation, and orthodox commentators, while anxious about edification, have not pursued Bible inquiries with the thoroughness or scientific precision which is necessary to-day, if work is to be useful and lasting.

Behind, then, the question of Inspiration, or the kind of Divine influence exerted, come several previous questions:—

1. Are these books genuine, what they profess to be, written by the men whose names they bear?
2. Are they authentic, the stories in them to be believed, or myths, legends, unverifiable traditions?
3. If both, are the writers trustworthy in the details of their narratives, accurate in method, or loose and careless, though honest?

4. Are all the books in the collection deserving of a place here? Why are there so many? Why not more? Are these different from the rest?

5. Then, if all are genuine, all authentic, all trustworthy in minute details, and determined by a satisfactory canon, then we may ask at length, What is the relation between the Divine and the human elements in their composition, so far as that can be determined?

It is by raising these questions that the inquiry of our day has seriously affected the structure of belief in Inspiration, and a large number of difficulties that men have in mind when they vaguely say, "I don't know what to believe about Inspiration," emerge at a much earlier stage, and must be dealt with on other grounds. I may add that many of them emerge at an altogether later stage, and belong properly to the right interpretation of Scripture. These are difficulties caused by mistranslation, misunderstanding of the true scope of the narrative, misunderstanding of the relation between Scripture and physical science and the like—all topics which concern the correct interpretation of a Book which more than any other needs to be used with care.

It is, of course, impossible in five minutes to describe the present attitude of scholarly criticism to the books of the Bible, nor is it necessary to do so. It may, however, be well to sum up the results of the minute and exhaustive investigation and reinvestigation given to the sacred books of late, by saying that it has spread all along the line and with somewhat varying results. In some cases there has been triumphant vindication both of the genuineness and authority of a given book, admitted by hostile critics; in others, the traditional authority has been shown to be untenable, without affecting the substance or value of the book itself; in many cases a measure of doubt still remains, or critics are divided into two or more camps, each preserving its own views. The discussion of the Pentateuch question has more or less clearly demonstrated its composite character, and enabled us to trace the documents which have been interwoven into its structure, while the attempt to bring down the body of the legislation to a period after the Exile remains a speculative theory, full of difficulties and incredibilities, though at present strongly in favour amongst many scholars of repute. Throughout the Old Testament signs of editorial care, of compilation, have been brought to light. In the Psalms we possess a series of collections, the dates of which it is somewhat difficult to trace, the attempt to bring these down to a late date being involved in the Pentateuchal theory just spoken of. The writings of the prophets are not so largely assailed by criticism, though the Isaianic authorship of the latter part of the book which goes by his name is now given up by the best scholars. Zechariah is thought by many to be composite in structure, and the controversy concerning the date of Daniel is by no means ended. In the New Testament the received dates of the composition of the three Synoptic Gospels is on the whole established, though students are still busy with the problem of the construction of these narratives, how they came to take the form they have, and what is their true relation to each other; while the attack on the genuineness, and therefore on the authority of the Fourth Gospel, has been triumphantly repelled, as shown in the last volume of Bampton Lectures. There are four unquestioned Epistles of St. Paul, and the arguments in favour of the genuineness of the rest have never been answered. The Pauline authorship of Hebrews, like the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes, is now by most abandoned.

All this is highly controversial matter. The above are not statements of my own opinions, and they would be attacked on both sides by those who think that too much weight has been given to current criticism, and by those who think that not enough weight has been given to it. But it is no object of mine to take up any position on any of these debated topics; I only wish to show what is the actual history of recent discussion, and how the question of Inspiration must be affected while these controversies are going on. It is natural for devout students of Scripture to become somewhat impatient. There are those who would meet all these inquiries as impious. They are completely equipped with a theory of Inspiration, that the whole Bible may be proved apart from these examinations to be Divine from end to end, and that the authority of the Word of God should silence such inquiries and give us peace again. Such persons fail to see (1) that this is impossible. It is the authority of the Book which is in question, and which must be re-established upon a basis good against the unbeliever, as well as for the believer. (2) That none of the inquiries need affect the simple faith of one who reads his Bible for edification, while they are of the highest importance for those whose work it is fully to understand and intelligibly to teach from this Book as the rule of faith and practice. (3) That out of these investigations and controversies, more or less disturbing at the moment, as out of many more battles besides, good will come, if the Church of Christ be faithful. It is that we may learn more concerning the Book of books, understand it better, have larger views of God's Word and ways, that this has been permitted. But to gain this we must be content to wait awhile, begin with the premisses of the argument, not with

its conclusions, make the pyramid rest upon its base, not upon its apex. The Inspiration of Scripture—*i.e.* the everywhere operating influence of the Divine Spirit throughout these books, which are many yet one—is indubitable, undoubted; the precise relation between the Divine and human elements is much more difficult to define, and that topic must be postponed till some others have been satisfactorily settled.

But where rests the authority of Scripture, if we do not begin with its Inspiration and infallibility? We cannot accept the view that it depends on the authority of the Church; still less on the Coleridgean doctrine that the Bible is true because it "finds me," commends itself directly to my heart and conscience. True, the doctrine of the Bible is connected both with the doctrine of the Church and the doctrine of conscience, but no satisfactory basis of authority is to be found in either of these. If we cannot appeal to the Bible as a standard, it may well be said, Where are we?

The answer is, the Bible is a standard, though not to be appealed to like the Koran, as a message from end to end sent direct from heaven. Its authority rests ultimately not upon the Book as a composition, but upon the revelation recorded in it. In establishing its authority, we must go to the Lord Jesus Christ—make the doctrine of Scripture Christo-centric. True, we can only reach Him through the record, but we can do that, without any elaborate theory as to what Scripture as a whole is. St. Mark's Gospel and the four unquestioned Epistles of St. Paul are more than enough to bring us into His presence and to enable us to answer the question, What think ye of Christ? As to the question, Do you believe in Christ because you believe in the Scripture, or do you believe in the Scripture because you believe in Christ, the Christian may say, "I cannot well separate the two;" but if I am pressed for a logical answer, it must be the second. I believe in Jesus Christ, God's Son our Lord, in the revelation there made of the Divine, and from that starting-point I find Christ stretching forth His arms on either side to establish the authority of Holy Scripture. Backwards to the Old Testament to which he constantly appeals as the authority for the Jew, and within certain limits for all men, as the Scriptures which in so many ways testified of Himself, the chief value of which to-day consists in the way they lead up to Him. Forwards to the New Testament as He sends forth His Apostles with the message commissioned by Himself, giving them authority to proclaim that which was afterwards recorded by those whose qualifications and credentials can be freely examined and have been satisfactorily established again and again.

I shall not stay to work out this argument, but ask you to bear in mind how much it contains when establishing the substantial authority of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. *For those who believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, there is an irremovable basis for the doctrine of Holy Scripture as a sufficient, complete, infallible guide in things pertaining to God, the sole authoritative rule of faith and practice.* When we pass from this to a close consideration of the *form* of the book or books, the precise way in which it has pleased God that this record should be made and come down to us, and the exact degree of influence exercised by His Spirit on the minds of the writers, the true relation of the history, the science, the theology of their own times, it is quite clear that large questions are opened up. If we begin with preconceived ideas of what the Revelation from God must be, many will be disappointed. It is quite clear, for example:—

1. Our Bible is a translation. We cannot imitate the Church of Rome, which, according to the Council of Trent, virtually takes the Vulgate as infallible.
2. It is not altogether easy to reach an accurate text. Both in the Old and New Testaments a minute, scientific investigation, not yet ended, is to determine this.
3. When we have obtained this, the form in which the revelation has come down to us, the form of the books and narratives, what seem gaps on the one hand and repetitions on the other, shows that here we have a human literature, embodying a Divine message not to be discerned at a glance, but which *makes* us think, compare, examine, weigh, judge.
4. In the simplest passages, the history of interpretation shows how many meanings may be attached to them, so that the infallible Book requires an infallible interpreter, if we are to have an infallible guide as Rome understands it. A Protestant who understands the meaning of his own creed should be an ardent and reverent student of the Bible, but not a Bibliolater.
5. The way in which the New Testament writers use the Old Testament shows the complexity of the whole subject. Reverence and appeal to authority are everywhere manifest, but also a measure of freedom for which we are hardly prepared, and an evident desire to dwell on the substantial meaning rather than the form of the record, the spirit rather than the letter of the Word.

When we examine the books more closely, the same need of intelligent discrimination appears at every turn.

(*a*) He who holds that these books are indeed the Word of God is compelled to examine into

their form and structure, the distinction between poetry, history, and prophecy; to inquire in what sense, to what degree, God may be said to speak, *e.g.* in the Book of Job, in the speculations of Ecclesiastes, in the visions of the Apocalypse,—he is compelled by the very variety of form and complexity of the questions raised to think and to distinguish, if he would understand and rightly receive the Divine message.

(*b*) The nature of Inspiration is raised by the acknowledged fact of the *progressive* character of the Divine Revelation herein contained. The unity of the Bible is not mechanical, but organic—represented by the growth and development of the plant, not by the erection of a monolith. The Law is a παιδαγωγός to lead us to Christ, and the stages of development can be ascertained, and must be intelligently distinguished. The Book of Genesis and the Book of Chronicles have their places in the history of the kingdom of God, but before we can understand the nature of the guidance given to the writers we must have some insight into the character of the place they occupy.

(*c*) The meaning of the Canon raises the same considerations. Why are there these books and no others in the inspired Canon; why not Ecclesiasticus as well as Ecclesiastes, Hermas as well as the Apocalypse; why not dispense with Esther or the Epistle of Jude? The answer would be a long one, but investigation shows how the Jews at the end of the Old Dispensation and the Christian Church at the beginning of the New were marvellously guided in the choice of books whose subject, character, or authorship fitted them for a place in the Revelation of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. An "Inspiration of selection" was vouchsafed both to the writers and to the compilers of the sacred Canon of Scripture.

It is needless to say that the view of this Book as a revelation, based on the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, implies the general accuracy and trustworthiness of the writers. There can be no room in a true theory of Inspiration for forgeries, "cooking" of narratives, pious frauds, inventions, myths, the rewriting of history or prophecy to suit the times. This is not to say that the literary habits of all generations are the same; that we take up the Books of Samuel as if reading Macaulay or Carlyle, or Freeman, judge by the same views of history, expect to find the same methods or aims. This is not to say that Ecclesiastes must have been written by Solomon because it contains his name, or that the terms "Moses" and "David" are never used with latitude and freedom for that which David and Moses did not actually write. But it does imply that frauds, however "pious," are utterly out of place in the Revelation of the All-Holy, in any part of the testimony concerning Him who is a Faithful and True Witness. Simplicity, ignorance, primitive habits of thought and speech may be expected, where such are in place; but if the Bible contains "cunningly-devised fables," though it may be an interesting collection of documents for historians or antiquarians, its authority as a sacred record and as a rule of faith is gone.

Biblical criticism may even point out the existence of much which we should not have expected in Scripture which yet does not interfere with its sacredness or authority. Analysis has been very busy of late years, many think far too busy. Yet it has its place, and synthesis will follow in due course. If, *e.g.*, we are taught to see two or three narratives, where formerly we saw only one; two or three hands at work on a single book, more of what we should call editorial supervision, of compilation, than we should have associated with the sacred documents, we need not be startled or disturbed. When we stand close to a Raphael or a Turner with a hand-glass, we perceive only rough dabs of paint. We may so stand that we can see nothing else, but the masterpiece remains for all that. Many of the critics' conclusions on these points are the merest dreams of a restless literary imagination, some are wildly speculative, some are demonstrably false, not to say self-contradictory. But if some of them that have to do with processes of composition, details of authorship, prove to be true, neither the authority nor the Inspiration of Scripture is necessarily interfered with.

It will be expected that such a record will be preserved free from error. It must imply freedom from such error as would interfere with the object for which the Revelation was given, else it fails to be a Divine Revelation. But will it not mean freedom from all error, absolute infallibility in every detail? We should answer, We must wait to see whether it be so, not begin with the absolute certitude that it is so of necessity, and refuse to give credence to it at all, unless it has been thus preserved from the slightest mistake. For the Bible as a series of records touches on a thousand subjects, and it is a large question how it may please God to deal with human writers as they deal with an immense variety of topics besides the one for which especially they were commissioned to write. Take for example,

Physical Science. Is it to be expected that the sacred writers should anticipate the conclusions of modern times? Most will answer, No; the record would have been unintelligible to their contemporaries. Arguments have been drawn from Scripture against the views of Galileo, of Lyell, of Darwin, it being assumed in each case that whatever seemed to contradict the language of Scripture must be false. Therefore the sun moves round the earth, the universe was created in six days, of twenty-four hours each, evolution in any shape is impossible! It is surely wiser to under-

stand the scope and meaning of Revelation before we assume that it was ever intended to teach physical science. On the other hand, there is a marvellous agreement between the outline of Genesis i. and modern scientific discovery, so that a distinguished scientific teacher has said one would only need to alter a word or two in the Bible account of Creation to harmonise it completely with the latest conclusions of physical science.

The discrepancies of Scripture have been much exaggerated, both as regards their number and importance. Genesis i. and ii. are clearly two narratives, not necessarily discrepant. In the Synoptic Gospels the very variations are evidence of independence; if the narratives had absolutely coincided they would have lost much of their weight. If the accounts of the blind men of Jericho, of Peter and the cock-crowing, of the Synoptics and John as to the day of Christ's death, appear to be discrepant and hard to reconcile, we must remember how often this happens in contemporary narrative till the explanation is known; how scanty is the record and our knowledge of the facts. Still, the perpetual recurrence of difficulties of detail in minor matters should prevent us from dogmatising as to the impossibility of mistake in any single particular.

On questions of history the authority of these books varies according to circumstances. Some are contemporary records, some very early and valuable, others later; all may be shown to be trustworthy. But it would be dangerous to set up a theory of the impossibility of mistake in detail, so that the authority of the Scripture as a whole would be gone, if any such were pointed out. This has been a fruitful cause of scepticism. Especially we should not do so without the clearest evidence from Scripture itself that the writers claimed this absolute and unerring knowledge. We need not then be disturbed by the evidence of clay cylinders, which may very easily be wrong in dates, but which may, on the other hand, be right.

This is not, of course, to say that we are lightly to assume the existence of error. In hundreds of instances the Scripture has been proved correct where for long this has been doubted or strenuously denied. So far from disparaging the accuracy of Scripture in trifles, the more careful and minute our study, the greater will be our marvel at the fidelity of these records in the minor as well as the more important matters with which they deal. Sixty-six books, by so many authors, covering a period of 2000 years, searched through and through by keenest eyes, and pierced by sharpest weapons of criticism, what books like those of Scripture could so have stood the test? The words of the Lord are pure words: "As silver tried in the furnace of earth, purified seven times." Yet if in the vessel grains of sand or morsels of lead should be found, they do not lessen the value of the mass of pure, white, shining silver, of precious, refined gold. It is a distorted vision that will look upon the specks of alloy till it cannot see the massive, pure metal; it is a mistaken fidelity to suppose that because the sacred treasure is pure gold, therefore the earthen vessel which contains it is itself of gold throughout. The vessel must hold the treasure safely and well; "Heaven soon sets right all other matters."

No attempt has been made here to lay down a theory of Inspiration. I have tried to show the lines on which to rest a faith in the plenary inspiration of Scripture as a trustworthy, adequate, and unerring record of God's revelation of Himself to men, without our being afraid of the fullest inquiry, of any results of sound and valid criticism. Especially does it seem at present important to keep well before us the great end and aim of all Revelation, "That we might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Cnrist whom Thou hast sent." Then questions of form, of detail, of vehicle will fall into their own subordinate place. We lose nothing by keeping before us with a single eye the great ends for which the Bible was written—even the Old Testament Scriptures, *δυνάμενα σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν*, "able to make wise unto salvation" through faith in Christ Jesus. We may lose much by being too eager about the means which we think necessary for securing those ends. Jewish Rabbis were praised for making "a hedge round the Law," but that ended in their paying chief attention to the hedge, and neglecting the spirit of the law it was meant to protect. In forming a theory of Inspiration we cannot be wrong in putting the first things first, and keeping the secondary things second. This will preserve us from many mistakes, and it will keep us from being impatient of inquiries which are as wholesome as they are inevitable, while it enables us to await with calm confidence the answers to some questions for which we may have to wait for some time to come. Thus in spite of the little clouds of dust raised by battles of critics here and there, the chariot of God rolls on its course. "Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness," and "through patience and comfort of the Scriptures" we shall embrace and ever hold fast the blessed hope of eternal life which is in Jesus Christ our Lord.

Döllinger's Letters.

Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees 1869–1887. By Ignaz von Döllinger. Authorised Translation. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1891. 178 pp. 3s. 6d.

The original of this intensely interesting little volume did not appear in Germany until June 1890, some five months after the venerable author's death. It is a collection of papers and letters, some of which had been already published at intervals in a more or less fugitive manner, while others had never seen the light, although the writer had told certain friends that he intended "some day" to publish one or more of them. Those who had the happiness of knowing him, know what a snare that "some day" was to him. He lived so long, and to the last was so capable of thought and work, that there always seemed to be time for carrying out his numerous literary projects. Procrastination with him was never an excuse for idleness; for idleness to him was misery. But it *was* an excuse for refusing to put into shape what he believed could be put into still better shape after even more material had been amassed. As his great pupil and friend has so well said of him, "He knew too much to write";[1] and he has died leaving a number of unfinished treatises, and a library of note-books, of which probably no one will be able to make very much use. Only Ulysses can draw the bow of Ulysses, and one must have something of Döllinger's prodigious knowledge and memory to be able to work with Döllinger's tools.

Professor Reusch, who has long been Döllinger's friend and literary colleague, lost no time in getting this important series of documents printed and published; and we owe it to the enterprise of Messrs. Clark that an English translation has followed so soon after the publication of the original volume. For those who cannot afford the money to buy, or the time to read, such books as *Janus*, or *Quirinus*, or Dr. Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*, the present volume will be invaluable: and indeed those who already possess and have read these and other books on the controversy which came to a climax in 1870, will need this little work to complete their grasp of the situation. For thirty or forty years Dr. Döllinger might be said to be the centre round which the chief currents of the agitation moved; and in this collection of papers we have his own clear statements, given at intervals during one-and-twenty years, of what has been at stake in the prolonged controversy about Papal Infallibility and Supremacy: this has been nothing more or less than the preservation of the Church's Creed and the Church's freedom. It was for this that he suffered, and continued to suffer till his death. As he wrote to Pastor Widmann in 1874: "It is the general indifference, and the indolent attitude of the clergy, which has only their own comfort in view, that have brought down this evil of the Vatican Council upon our heads. The greater the number of those who confess the truth and free themselves from false doctrine and implicit obedience, the greater becomes the hope of recovery" (p. 120).

The translator does not give his name; but he has done his work well. In one respect he has made an addition to the original. He has been able to discover that the very characteristic reply written by Döllinger to some clerical correspondent in February 1868 is addressed to Dr. Westermayer, Rector of S. Peter's, Munich. When Professor Reusch published the reply last year, the letter to which it was the answer could not be found.

Alfred Plummer.

[1] Lord Acton in the *English Historical Review*, October 1890.

Requests and Replies.

1. Is it possible for me to get a sufficient knowledge of Greek to read the New Testament without a teacher? If so, what book would you recommend to a beginner as being simple and easy for self-teaching?

2. Whose system of "Christian Ethics" do you think the best?

3. What work on "Inspiration" is there published—cheap, yet reliable?—J. B.

1. I doubt the possibility of gaining effective knowledge of Greek without teaching of some kind. Mere ability to read and construe would give little advantage over the reader of English only. There are correspondence classes which give instruction. If the attempt is made without teaching, good books to begin with are Morris's *Greek Lessons*, Part I., 2s. 6d.; Part II., 1s. (Longmans).

2. Martensen's is the best. The difficulty about it is its high price. I know no satisfactory book of moderate size. A small book is promised in Clark's *Handbook Series*.

3. Given, *The Truth of Scripture* (Clark, 6s.) gives the old view succinctly. There is no book, so far as I know, which presents the whole subject in the light of recent study. W. D. Thomson, *Revelation and the Bible* (Macniven & Wallace), Fisher, *Nature and Method of Revelation* (Unwin), are brief, suggestive discussions. Sanday, *The Oracles of God* (Longmans), also shows the direction which thought on the subject is taking.

J. S. Banks.

Expository Papers.

Psalms and Hymns and Spiritual Songs.

EPHESIANS v. 19.

WITH reference to the Rev. Alfred Gill's note on the above in last EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 165), permit me to question the following statement therein: "'Speaking to one another' does not mean the ordinary interchange of thought or carrying on a conversation in the usual manner, but that the oral communications at these particular gatherings (whether for definite worship or not) took the shape indicated in the above expressions. The additional explanatory words in the like passage in Colossians (iii. 16), 'teaching and admonishing,' helps us to understand the benefit to be gained by this interchange of thought." In my judgment, the early and later half of Mr. Gill's exposition are mutually destructive; for while in the former he tells us that the phrase examined "does *not* mean the ordinary *interchange of thought*," in the latter he designates "the benefit to be gained by *this interchange of thought*." Surely Mr. Gill does not wish us to believe that all was mere singing in the enjoined instructing on duty, warning the negligent, exhorting the heedless? You must give abnormal or mere etymological meanings to λαλέω, διδάσκω, νουθετέω, unless you understand thereby that the "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" having been sung or having formed their PRAISE, those present thereafter followed this up with "interchange of thought" on the topics suggested by the successive "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs." I for one hold strenuously that the Church of Christ has impoverished the function of praise by limiting it to mere singing and playing. I should rejoice to see the apostolic usage revived at our prayer-meetings and in private gatherings ("two or three") by "interchange of thought" on the higher or lower, the brighter or darker, the known or unknown experiences expressed in the "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" that have been sung or read. Moreover, our Praise in the Church will be all the more intelligent if the preacher, occasionally at least, said a few guiding words on particular psalms or hymns, and if the Lord's people in their own homes sought to "teach and admonish" one another by conversation thereon. Whilst thus constrained to question one statement, I wish cordially to thank Mr. Gill for his scholarly note—only let us shun mere etymology, and not confound exegesis with exposition.

ALEXANDER B. GROSART.

Blackburn, Lancashire.

The Indwelling of the Spirit in Individuals.

While gladly welcoming Dr. Ringwood's article, and heartily concurring with him in his main contention—that it is non-scriptural to speak of each individual Christian as a separate and complete temple of the Holy Spirit—I was quite surprised and disappointed to find that he seems to think we are shut up to the conclusion "that 'your body,' *i.e.* the body of you (plur.) in 1 Cor. vi. 19, does not mean the body of an individual Christian, but that which consists of all Christians, and is described as the body of Christ."

I think that "your body" certainly does mean there the body of an individual Christian. Dr. Ringwood himself describes the individual Christian as a "living portion" of the temple of the Holy Spirit. Now every portion of the temple is the temple. If I go up to a temple and damage one of the stones or pillars, I am damaging the temple. Can I plead that I did not damage the temple because I did not damage every part, or the most part? If I desecrate the very smallest portion of it, I desecrate the whole. If I am in Fife I am certainly in Scotland, and if I am on Fife-ness I am in Scotland. So, then, although most plainly there is but one temple of the Holy Spirit, "the temple of His (Christ's) body," yet being a member of that body, and a living stone in that spiritual house, I am that temple. And not only so, but being sanctified wholly, body, soul, and spirit, every part of me is the temple—my body, my heart, my hand. If I defile my heart, I defile the temple; if I defile my hands with unworthy deeds, I defile the temple.

I think this is most clearly the meaning of the Apostle, yet no exposition I have ever seen or heard supports me in so understanding it. I wish therefore to ask if there is any serious bar to it.

GEORGE HENDERSON.

Edinburgh.

The Righteousness of Noah.

GENESIS vi. 9.

Amid the terrible wickedness of his times Noah stands out upright and holy. "Among the faithless, faithful only he."

I. The Righteousness of Noah. While the two words "just" and "perfect" at some points overlap each other, they are not identical. He was *just*,

"a man who gave to all their due." (1) His *conduct* was righteous. It must have been difficult to live a righteous life amid such associates and surroundings. Numbers, prestige, wealth were all on the side of wickedness, but, like the Puritans in the times of the Stuarts, Noah remained rigid, unbending. Bribes were futile, threatenings vain. (2) His *character* was holy. Actions may not always correspond with character (Prov. xxiii. 7). The idea of the word "perfect" is completeness; he was pious as well as moral—blameless in the midst of his contemporaries.

II. The Secret of his Righteousness. "Noah walked with God." That phrase implies (1) reconciliation with God (Amos iii. 3). See Binney's *Practical Power of Faith*, p. 56. He acquiesces in the Divine will. What power would the fact of reconciliation give to him! The phrase also implies (2) habitual devotion. Communion with God is itself an occasion of strength (Ps. cxxxviii. 3; Isa. xl. 31). This was the grand secret of his power.

III. The Lessons of his Life. We learn (1) the possibility of living a holy life amid unfavourable surroundings. A signal example this. The pure white flower of religion often blooms in the most unlikely places (Gen. xxxix. 21; 1 Kings xviii. 3; Phil. iv. 22). We further learn (2) the preparation of uneventful times for great occasions. Five hundred years a monotony—one day very much like another—yet all the time a preparation going on for the carrying out of the greatest commission ever entrusted to man. So it is in life now. However lowly, *do the duty which lies nearest thee.* Sartor Resartus, p. 135.

A. Hampden Lee.

Walsall.

Cain's Envy.

Genesis iv. 7, 8.

God is no respecter of persons, and yet it appears as if Cain were rejected and Abel accepted for quite arbitrary reasons. A story so brief as this is necessarily incomplete. If all the details were given we should see the reason for this preference. But we have hints given us. It was not because of the difference in that which they sacrificed: each brought of the fruits of his toil as God had in each case blessed it. The difference must be sought in the disposition of the worshippers. Plato in *Alcibiades* says, "It would be strange if the gods looked to gifts and sacrifices, and not to the soul." There was something in Cain's disposition displeasing to God. His heart was a soil where seeds of envy easily took root and grew.

1. *The Cause of Cain's Envy.*—Cain was envious not altogether because God had rejected his offering, but rather because while doing so He had accepted the offering of Abel. This, however, is only the proximate cause. God asks Cain, "If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted?" And the manner of the question is such as to anticipate an affirmative answer. This implies that Cain was already an "evil-doer." And as such, it was impossible for God to accept him. Cain was ready to accuse God of partiality, and to assign this as a reason for the rejection of his offering.

2. *The Dangers to which Cain exposed himself by his Envy.*—He brooded over his rejection. His black looks ("why is thy countenance fallen?") indicated the state of his heart. The seed of envy having been sown, he set to work to cherish it. He was angry with God, and he was angry with his brother; but he never thought of seeking the cause in his own heart. "Fret not thyself, it tendeth only to evil-doing" (Ps. xxxvii. 8, R.V.). So it was with Cain. He hated his brother for that goodness which had brought him the favour of God. He hated him because his brother was better than himself, and he felt as though his brother had defrauded him of that blessing which he deemed he merited. By yielding to, and cherishing such thoughts, he was preparing himself to be a ready prey to the foe lurking at the door of his heart.

3. *Cain's only Choice now was to resist Envy or to become its Prey.*—"If thou doest not well, sin lurks at the door, as a beast of prey waiting for its victim, and his desire is unto thee; he thirsts for thy life, but thou shouldest rule over him." Envious thoughts at first are like the young beast which can easily be overcome; but in silent waiting they grow strong until we are completely at their mercy. We think we are not envious because our foe is not seen, but this is only because he is in ambush. Our danger is greater on this account. We may wander near that ambush; an unexpected event may afford the opportunity, and in a moment the foe is upon us. If we do not resist early there is small hope of escape. "Be watchful: your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour: whom withstand." Cain did not withstand, and in an evil moment slew his brother, and thus brought down the curse of God upon himself.

R. C. Ford.

Alfreton.

"Our Wrestling."

Ephesians vi. 12.

The words "we wrestle," etc., of the A.V. are given more correctly in the R.V., "our wrestling

is not against," etc. The words as written by St. Paul are ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν (or ὑμῖν as read by B, D, etc.) ἡ πάλη πρὸς, etc. What does the Apostle mean by ἡ πάλη—in view of the context? This section, beginning with ver. 10, has for its subject the arming of the Christian for the fight against sin. What we must inquire is this, What connection has ἡ πάλη with τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, with θώρακα and θυρεὸν, with περικεφαλαίαν and μάχαιραν? Most commentators give the meaning of πάλη as simply "wrestling;" but we may well ask whether this exhausts the intended significance of the word. Seeing that the reference to armour occurs both in the previous verse, ver. 11, and again in vers. 14, 16, 17, is it not possible that the Apostle meant to describe the Christian not as a mere wrestler, but as an armed wrestler, that is, a gladiator? Surely the whole context makes this not only possible, but probable. A wrestler had no need of such armour as is here described: he did not require to guard himself against darts,—τὰ βέλη, ver. 16; but here he is warned that a shield is needed with which to quench, σβέσαι, the fiery darts of the evil one. But a gladiator had to wrestle, and he was armed for the struggle. "Wrestling" may be a mere friendly trial of skill, but this is not what St. Paul speaks of. He evidently refers to the gladiatorial shows, where the brutal sports were engaged in, in which the Romans so much delighted. He sets before his readers that the conflict against sin is no mere pastime, but a hand-to-hand struggle involving death: the Christian must either conquer or die. If we do not conquer sin, sin will kill us. Such is the Christian πάλη.

As increasing the probability that it is the gladiator and not the soldier that is depicted in this section, it may be mentioned that the gladiator used all the arms here mentioned—the θώρακα, the θυρεὸν, the περικεφαλαίαν: he was armed with breastplate, shield, and helmet, all these being defensive weapons, while he was also provided with a μάχαιρα to attack his opponent. Is it not remarkable that one of the most important arms of a soldier—the spear—is not mentioned at all by the Apostle? So important was the spear in the Roman army, that until about B.C. 100 this weapon gave its name to the foremost line of the army as it marched to battle, the Hastati. In the century preceding, and that immediately following the Christian era, the army was rearranged, and all the legionaries carried the *pilum*, a javelin upwards of six feet in length. Why did St. Paul not mention this indispensable weapon of the soldier? Surely the answer is, that he here pictures the Christian as a gladiator.

JOHN RUTHERFURD.

Rothesay.

The Apocalypse.

The Revelation of St. John. By the late Rev. W. H. SIMCOX, M.A., Rector of Harlaxton (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges). Cambridge, 1890. 3s.

THIS is an interesting addition to the literature of the Revelation. The size and object of the work, of course, prevent its being a full commentary on the Book, and not seldom the brief notes break off just at the point where we should have wished them to begin; but the work reflects the method and results of the modern historical interpretation of the Apocalypse better than anything yet published in this country. The author proceeds on the principle that the literal sense of the Book is to be presumed to be the true sense, and that the prophet John, like all prophets, refers to objects—forces and personages—belonging to his own time. What the interpreter has to do, is to work himself into the movements of this age and realise their meaning. It is obvious that this principle at once disposes of the huge mass of interpretations which have accumulated over the Book. All such interpretations are without value, except those of the first three centuries. Because in point of fact the revolution under Constantine completely altered the aspect of the world as it was in John's day, with the effect of altogether confusing the outlook of subsequent interpreters. One great figure in the Apocalypse, the persecuting world power, represented by the beast, was removed, at least as an external object. Henceforth it had to be interpreted spiritually, and this spiritual interpretation of one figure reacted on all the elements of the Book, and led to a spiritual or non-literal interpretation in their case also. This change appears in the age of Jerome and Augustine, for whom the millennial reign of the saints means nothing more than the present normal condition of the Christian Church in the world, favoured and no more persecuted by the ruling powers. But any reader can see that this is not the natural meaning of the Revelation.

In a very candid and scholarly introduction the writer discusses (1) the authorship and canonicity; (2) the date and place of composition; and (3) principles of interpretation of the Book. Under the first head he asks whether it be possible to consider the Gospel and the Revelation to be by one author. Perhaps here he may rather magnify similarities and extenuate differences between the two Books, though on the whole the latter are candidly acknowledged. He lays, perhaps, more weight than it can bear on the fact that Christ is once in the Revelation called the Word of God—failing to ask the question whether the expression be used in the same sense as in the Gospel. So

also the use of the word "true" (*alethinos*) is a little pressed. This word really needs some further discussion. One writer after another tells us that it means "real"; but what sense is there in such language as "just and *real* are thy ways"? The term needs elucidation from the Hebrew words of which it is the rendering in the Septuagint. The conclusion which the writer comes to is this: "If we suppose that the Revelation was written by St. John the Apostle between A.D. 68–70, and the Gosple and Epistles A.D. 80–100, we get a credible view of the history of the Apostle's mind, or at least of his style." This view, here put hypothetically, is the one adopted in the chapter on the date and place of composition, the testimony of Irenæus in regard to date being rejected as incompatible with the internal evidence. Probably the writer did not himself feel it, but the effect of his reasoning is to leave the impression that there is really no independent tradition regarding the date and place of composition, the floating traditions recorded being all mere variants and embellishments of the statement in the Book, "I, John, . . . was in the isle that is called Patmos."

In regard to principles of interpretation, the author agrees in general with the modern school of historical interpreters, who believe that the figures and personages in the Book are all to be sought in John's own day, with the religious meaning which they had to him. So far he is what is called a Preterist. He adds, however, another principle, to the effect that the figures and personages in John's pages are also "typical," and that in the future more perfect representatives of them will appear, *e.g.* of the antichrist and the like. In this way the author becomes a Futurist, and, it may be added, himself an Apocalyptist. Examples of his method are these:—The measuring of the Temple (chap. xi.), some figurative elements being admitted, implies that the Temple was still standing. The two witnesses are Moses and Elias, whose future appearance may be looked for—"there is no reason why we should not . . . understand the chapter as foretelling a sign which shall literally come to pass in the last days." The woman of chap. xii. is the Jewish Church, who gave birth to the Messiah. The beast (chap. xiii.) is the Roman power in same sense, and the seven heads are seven emperors. The head wounded to death is Nero, who also, when he returned from the "abyss," is the beast in his final antichristian form. The author, however, pleads for a somewhat vague conception here: the beast is regarded as Nero in the same way as the Messiah is called "David" in the prophets. The harlot is Rome pagan, though it is "not possible to restrict the application to the pagan Rome of the past." As to this, the author's view may be correct, though his argument is certainly weak—"Rome could not be said to commit fornication with *the kings of the earth*, whom it was her policy to enslave by force." Was this less the policy of Assyria than it was of Rome? And yet Nahum (chap. iii. 4) speaks of Nineveh as the well-favoured harlot. Finally, the first resurrection is to be understood literally—"if the true sense be *not* the literal one, it is safest to regard it as being as yet undiscovered"—and so also the millennial reign. Everywhere the author adheres to the natural sense of the language, giving what he conceives to have been John's meaning and the subjects to which *he* referred. The principle of "types," however, permits that the ideas and principles which John saw, represented or embodied in the personages and forces of his day, may have another and more perfect realisation in the future.

There is one point in which this little work, in common with most others, seems to come short, and that is in the recognition of what might be called the "supernaturalness" of the Revelation. The conflict in it, though waged on earth, is not a human warfare; it is waged by combatants who are divine or diabolical. Satan gave his power to the beast. All those interpretations, therefore, such as those of Weiss, Völter, Spitta, etc., which find actual human persons, such as Domitian, in the beast or false prophet, are manifestly untrue to John's idea. In the last stage of the development, all the agents—the beast, the false prophet, the witnesses, and the like—are superhuman. And this stage lies entirely in the future to the eye of the seer.

The interpretation of the Apocalypse has now reached a stage when the question of its unity and homogeneousness as a Christian composition imperatively requires discussion. Those who have followed recent attempts to disintegrate it, may continue to be of opinion that fewer difficulties attend the traditional theory of its unity than beset any of the newer theories. This may be, but the unity of the Book cannot any longer be assumed. No work on the Book will now receive attention, nor deserve it, which is not fundamentally critical. The idea that there are Jewish elements in the Book has sufficient substance to deserve serious attention. How, for example, are the 144,000 sealed out of the tribes of Israel to be reconciled with the multitude which no man could number in chap. vii.? If the two witnesses be Moses and Elias, is there anywhere found a Christian belief that they were to appear before Christ's *Second* Coming (chap. xi.)? If the woman in chap. xii. be the Jewish Church, is it a Christian idea that the Church gave birth to the Messiah? The Apostle says that Jerusalem alone is mother of us all: would he or any Christian writer have said that she was mother of Christ?

A. B. Davidson.

On the Rendering "Daily Bread" in the Lord's Prayer.

By the Rev. Principal J. B. M'Clellan, M.A.

In Luke xi. 1 there is recorded one of the most wide-reaching and spiritual incidents of the Saviour's life. He had prayed—one of his many private prayers—and, His prayer ended, "*one of His disciples*," whose name is hidden from men, but written, we doubt not, "*in the Lamb's Book of Life*," said unto Him, "*Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.*" From that request of that unknown disciple (whether before or after or simultaneous with the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, as recorded by St. Matthew, we need not, for present purposes, inquire) came the gracious answer which now for nearly two thousand years has uplifted the hearts of millions of Adam's children of every race and tongue to the One Eternal Father in heaven, and put words of reverential brevity and prevailing power into their mouths, as in days alike of joy and sorrow, life and death, they have prefaced all their utterances of want and thanksgiving to the Almighty God with the cry of "*Abba, Father.*" And, in passing, it is valuable to notice that this deliberate act of Christ in the "teaching" of prayer, in response to the infirmity and ignorance of man (for "*we know not what prayer to make, τί προσευξώμεθα, as we ought*," Rom viii. 26), approved and confirmed the act of the Baptist in his "teaching" of prayer, and similarly by anticipation sanctioned the practice for all time.

The "form" of prayer taught by our Lord has naturally eclipsed that taught by His forerunner, and by all other teachers. "*The Lord's Prayer*" abides, the model of all Christian prayer now and to the end of the world. We might, therefore, naturally suppose that the meaning of all its clauses and phrases would be well understood by the Church, and have been uniformly known and handed down from the beginning. It is then, confessedly, a startling fact, and one little or not at all recognised by the large majority of Christians, that at least one clause, containing that one phrase which stands at the head of this note, has all along the centuries been involved in more or less obscurity, as far back as its interpretations can be traced, whether in version or in exposition. Christian men and women, and the Church at large, in the closet and in the sanctuary, in private prayer and in public Eucharist, in the original Aramaic and in divers tongues of the great human family, have daily used this model prayer, and daily prayed for "daily bread," without any certain, authorised, and generally accepted meaning attached to the words; and almost universally, as far as private individuals are concerned, without any consciousness of what is (let us at present simply say) most probably the true meaning and comprehensiveness of the phrase. It is my object in the present note to endeavour clearly to elucidate the expression, firmly to establish what I conceive to be its true signification, and to suggest accordingly for Christian use a better than the common and familiar rendering. In doing this I must ask leave to borrow to some extent from the fuller and more formal discussion in my volume on the Gospels;[1] and it may add to whatever help the present note can afford, if I remark that repeated consideration for more than ten years has only confirmed the line and main results of argument there previously advanced.

Now, at the outset, it might be thought at once that, as far as English-speaking Christians are concerned, the question is already really closed, inasmuch as the Revised Version has supported and retained the Authorised Version rendering. But this is not the case. The Revisers, in their retention of the phrase "daily bread," were influenced by two main considerations—(1) the duty of not departing from familiar usage, especially in a case like the present, except on grounds of absolute certainty (a rule far too much neglected by them elsewhere); and (2) by the results of an examination of the phrase specially undertaken for them by the late learned and lamented Bishop of Durham (*On Rev. of N. T.*, app. i. pp. 195–234). With the deepest respect for whatever came from the pen of this eminent and finished scholar, it must be said that, with his wide research and almost unequalled talent for investigations of this character, it is most surprising that his efforts demonstrably fail, as I shall show, to accomplish the objects which he proposed for his task, and that his conclusions are directly contrary to the very evidence which he himself adduces. His argument, however, unsatisfactory and unsound as it undoubtedly is, will always deserve and repay careful study. It has the great merit of giving clear prominence to the testimony of the ancient versions and the tenor of tradition; and, as a whole, is successful against various interpretations grounded on false etymology.

[1] *The New Test.: A New Trans. from a Revised Greek Test., with Harmony of the Gospels, Notes and Dissertations*, etc. Vol. i. *The Four Gospels.* 1875. Macmillan.

But, nevertheless, its conclusions in favour of the English word "*daily*" as a fair representation of the original, and in accordance with the oldest tradition, is opposed alike to the acknowledged signification of the English word, and to "the traditional sense" on which it relies. It is still, therefore, a matter of high importance, even for English-speaking Christians, and especially for all teachers and preachers, *not* to consider the question in this way closed, but to submit it for themselves to a fresh, impartial, and thorough examination.

Without entering into any reason for the shorter exhibition of the Lord's Prayer in St. Luke (*i.e.* in certain MSS. of St. Luke, as the case may be), I will, for clearness' sake, take the words as they occur in the full form given by St. Matthew (vi. 9–13), and consider them in the light (1) of *tradition;* (2) of *etymology;* and (3) of their *setting and context.*

The Greek words of the phrase are τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον. The difficulty lies in ἐπιούσιον, *epiousion*, a word which, as Origen (Cent. iii.) observed, "*is never even mentioned in any of the Greek philosophical writers, nor used in the every-day language of the common people, but seems to have been coined by the evangelists*" (*De Orat.* 27). This remarkable fact at once suggests, of and by itself, that so simple a rendering as the English "*daily*," for which common Greek words existed and were at the service of the evangelists (*e.g.* τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς actually occurs in Jas. ii. 15),[1] *cannot* be the right explanation, but that we have here, in cryptogram as it were, something of a *mystery*. I lay great stress upon this point, and I ask my readers to do so also, though I must not now dwell upon it: it will reappear in the sequel. In great measure, however, from this fact of the word being a new and isolated word in the Greek, has sprung the multiplicity of renderings by divines and scholars which astonishes and perplexes all who hear of them. They may be examined to some extent in Meyer's *Comm. in loc.* and similar works, and especially in Bishop Lightfoot's treatise and Suicer's *Thesaurus, s.v.*, which, for the old interpretations, is still the best storehouse.

I. Taking, then, our first branch of inquiry, viz. that of *tradition*, and giving the principal views and leading supporters, we may conveniently arrange the interpretations after the Aramaic vernacular and oldest versions (which are prior to all extant expositions) as follows:—

(1) After the Aramaic Vernacular, or Gospel according to the Hebrews[2] (Cent. i. or ii.). Jerome, who (Cent. iv.) translated this Gospel, expressly testifies that he found there for ἐπιούσιον the word *mahar* (Heb. מָחָר, Aram. מְחָר, Syr. ܡܚܪ), "which," says he, "is in Latin *crastinum, belonging to to-morrow;* so that the sense is, *our to-morrow's bread*, i.e. *our future bread.*" In Heb. the word signifies *to-morrow*, but is constantly used in Old Test., not only of the literal *to-morrow*, but also of all *time to come;* and, as derived from אָחַר *hinder, following*, answers in great measure to the Greek τὸ μέλλον, *the future*. This interpretation of *to-morrow, future*, must be specially marked. It is the earliest, and, as such, very weighty evidence; the evidence of the Aramaic vernacular, for which Bishop Lightfoot rightly claimed the highest value. And it will be found to confirm, and be confirmed by, much of the evidence that follows. On the side of this interpretation will be deservedly found an imposing array of great modern scholars, as Suicer, Scaliger, the older Lightfoot (*Horæ Hebr.*), Wetstein, Bengel, Meyer, Winer, Bretschneider, and Grimm. With this agree the early Coptic or Egyptian Versions (Cent. iii.), both testifying to an original מָחָר or מָחָר; the Thebaic rendering being equivalent to *panem advenientem, coming bread;* and the Memphitic, to *panem crastinum, bread of to-morrow.* (See Lightfoot, *l.c.*)

(2) After Old (African) Latin Version (Cent. ii.): *quotidianum, daily.* This is justly a most remarkable rendering, being the parent of the familiar "*daily*" in all the Churches of the West to the present day. So, accordingly, following Tyndale, all the great English Protestant Versions, including the Authorised and Revised Versions: so also Luther, and in St. Luke (but not in St. Matthew), Jerome himself, the Vulgate, and the Roman Catholic Versions. Yet this Latin word *quotidianum* (and therefore the English "*daily*" taken from it) is not, and cannot be, and probably was never intended to be, an equivalent of the original ἐπιούσιον or מָחָר. One Latin Father, Victorinus (Cent. iv., *De Trin. c. Arium*, i. 31), though wrong in his own derivation of ἐπιούσιον, distinctly, and with great probability in his favour, attributes the Old Latin *quotidianum* to the *inability of the Latins* [of Africa] *to understand or express in the Latin tongue* the Greek word; and hence, he says, "they have merely put *quotidianum, daily*, not ἐπιούσιον." And another, St. Ambrose (Cent. iv., *De Sacr.* v. 4), says that "the Latins called this bread *quotidianum, daily*, which was called by the Greeks *advenientem, coming*, because the Greeks call the *coming* day τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἡμέραν."

(3) After Peshito Syriac Version (Cent. ii.: revised, Cent. iv.): ܕܣܘܢܩܢ, *indigentiæ nostræ*,

[1] So St. Chrysostom interprets here: τὸν ἐπιούσιον, τουτέστι τὸν ἐφήμερον. Others are noticed in the sequel.

[2] I see no sufficient reason for doubting that St. Matthew himself, according to the testimony of Papias, wrote his original Gospel in Aramaic, and that this prayer formed part of it. The Aramaic phrase *debts* in ver. 12 is an interesting point of evidence. But the present argument is independent of this question.

of our need, needful. This is also a most noteworthy rendering, both from its antiquity and the close kinship of the Syriac with the Aramaic; and it is followed by the learned Mede, Schleusner, Lange, Stier, Wordsworth, and Alford. Yet it is difficult to conceive that even this (though probably the second-best interpretation) is really a direct rendering of the original: it savours (possibly like *quotidianum*) of being an adaptation of expediency. For this idea the Greek language could have supplied the ἐπιτήδειον of Jas. ii. 16, or the δέον or αὐτάρκη of the LXX. version of Prov. xxx. 8 (Heb. לֶחֶם חֹק, *bread of portion*, Vulg. *victui necessaria;* A.V. *food convenient;* R.V. *food that is needful.* Cf. Gen. xlvii. 22, where there is the same Hebrew word, "*the priests did eat their portion*"). And, indeed, Delitzsch, in his scholarly Hebrew Version of the New Testament for the British and Foreign Bible Society, does thus render this phrase of the Prayer, viz. לֶחֶם חֻקֵּנוּ, *the bread of our portion.*

(4) After Jerome's Latin Version (Cent. iv.): *supersubstantialem, supersubstantial.* So, accordingly, the Vulgate, and Wycliffe (*over other substance*) and the Roman Catholic Version. But this is in St. Matthew only. In St. Luke, popular prejudice against change proving too strong, Jerome retains the Old Latin familiar *quotidianum.* Yet he is evidently in great perplexity over the word. At other times, like even some of the Greek Fathers, he wrongly identifies it with the well-known περιούσιον of Old Testament (as if περί and ἐπί were interchangeable prepositions!), and, as in the phrase "*peculiar people,*" gives it the interpretation of *præcipuum, egregium, peculiarem, special* or *peculiar* bread. But, again and later, in his comm. on Ezek. xviii. 7, he gives "*substantivum, sive superventurum,*" adding, "so that what we are to receive *always hereafter,* we may receive *daily now;*" as if he finally preferred the sense of the old *crastinum, future,* of the Aramaic.

It is not necessary, or possible, to reproduce here at length the testimonies and expositions of the early Fathers in accordance with the above. They are fully given and commented upon in my "Gospels" above referred to. It will suffice here to point out that the African Latin Fathers, Tertullian and Cyprian, naturally follow the Old Latin *quotidianum;* as also St. Augustine, with the important explanation that *daily* means "as long as this temporal life lasts, and that after this life, the succession of days being over, we shall be so filled with spiritual food eternally, that it will no longer be *daily* bread" (*De Serm. Dom.* ii. 8). Origen of Alexandria (Greek, Cent. iii., *De Orat.* 27), though well aware of a derivation from ἐπιέναι (of which, below), and that the bread prayed for "was held by some in his day to be that which is *proper to the future age,* and granted now by anticipation," was the first to propound or give weighty sanction to a derivation of the word from οὐσία, *substance,* as confirming the generally admitted reference to the Incarnate Word; and thus was the way prepared for Jerome's uncouth *supersubstantialem* in Cent. iv., and the polemical usage of the phrase in the great Arian Controversy. St. Athanasius, however, the Greek champion of the orthodox faith against the Arians, expressly declares that "in the Lord's Prayer the Lord calls the *Holy Spirit heavenly bread,* saying, Give us to-day our ἐπιούσιον bread: for in that prayer He taught us to ask in the present world for τὸν ἐπιούσιον, *i.e.* τὸν μέλλοντα, the *future* bread, a *first fruit* whereof we have in the present life, partaking of the flesh of the Lord, as John vi. 51, which is the life-giving Spirit" (Cent. iv., *De Incarn.* 16). The main and memorable fact connected with the various expositions of the Fathers is this—that they revolve in circles round two central points; one (*a*) the truth that Christians are bidden by the Lord not to be anxious, as others, for *bodily food* or for the *temporal morrow,* and may therefore only ask for *one day's* food, and that the one very *present* and not the *coming* day (Matt. vi. 25–34); and the other (*b*) that *Christ Himself* is the *Bread* of God's children, given in and by the Holy Spirit in the daily *Eucharist.*

II. Passing on to our second branch of inquiry, and seeking further light from this new quarter, the broad question is whether the word ἐπιούσιον is to be deemed to be (*a*) ἐπι-ούσιον, and derived (as by Origen, *supra*) from οὐσία, *essentia, substantia, essence, substance;* as, *e.g.*, ἐν-ούσιος, ἐξ-ούσιος, ὁμο-ούσιος, and such like (examples of which may be readily seen in Dr. Sophocles' *Lex. Byz. s.v.*); or (*b*) ἐπ-ιούσιον, and derived (as by St. Athanasius, *supra*) from ἐπιέναι, through the participle ἐπ-ιών, ἐπ-ιοῦσα (*subaud.* χρόνος, αἰών, ἡμέρα — for which see Lidd. and Scott, *Greek Lex. s.v.* ἐπιέναι), *on-coming, future,* time, world, or day; as ἐθελ-ούσιος from ἐθέλ-ων, ἑκ-ούσιος from ἑκ-ών, περι-ούσιος from περι-ών, etc. Now, with regard to (*a*), it is adverse that it was never dreamt of, or, at all events, never seriously entertained till Origen invented or patronised it in Cent. iii., more than two hundred years after the deliverance of the Prayer—a fact which alone suffices to overthrow it; but, yet further, it utterly fails to account for a parent vernacular (and *some* parent vernacular there must have been), and for the earlier versions, that is to say, for the *quotidianum* of the Latin, the *indigentiæ* of the Syriac, the *advenientem* of the Egyptian, and especially for the Aramaic *crastinum,* מָחָר. Still more: against it lies the formidable etymological objection, long since remarked by Scaliger (Suicer, i. 1170), that, according to the unswerving rule of Greek composition, the final ι in ἐπί (although not so in περί) would be elided before the initial vowel in -ούσιον,

and the combination result in ἐπ-ούσιον, not ἐπι-ούσιον,—just as in ἐπ-ουράνιος, and more impressively in ἐπ-ουσία, ἐπ-ουσίωσις, etc. (examples of these in Soph. *Lex. s.v.v.*). Bishop Lightfoot has conclusively pointed out that all apparently contradictory forms, such as ἐπι-εικής, ἐπί-ορκος, are due to the original presence of the consonant *digamma* after the ἐπὶ in these words; whereas this letter was disused for centuries before Christ.

There is, of course, just the bare possibility that the word was *monstrously* formed by its unknown authors or introducers in ignorance of, or in violation of all Greek usage; but such a possibility is not supported by any evidence, nor has it the slightest probability in its favour. We are, therefore, brought to the irresistible conclusion, with all that the conclusion entails, that the word ἐπιούσιον is formed and has its origin from ἐπιών, ἐπιοῦσα, *on-coming*, *future*, or *to come*. It would thus be a not unnatural but appropriate rendering into Greek of the Aramaic vernacular מָחָר, assuming (as we have above seen to be the case) that such existed, and would, like that vernacular, answer to the Latin *crastinum* or *adventientem*, and the English *morrow's* or *future*. The full meaning of the phrase would not hereby be determined; but we may not unreasonably discern in its employment some confirmation of the view above suggested by the uniqueness of the term, viz., that esoteric teaching was intended; and, at all events, cannot fail to recognise in the etymology another condemnation of the English rendering *daily*, and a confirmation of the reference to *the life which is to come*.

III. Our third branch of inquiry remains, the *setting* of the phrase. Let us see, therefore, what assistance is obtained from a consideration of its *position* in the Prayer, and the entire *context*. For this purpose let the Prayer be arranged after the order of the Greek, thus:—

Our Father which art in Heaven,
Hallowed be — *Thy Name;*
Come — *Thy Kingdom;*
Done be — *Thy Will, as etc.;*
Our bread, the epiousion, *give us to-day,*
And forgive us our debts,
And bring us not into temptation, but, etc.

In this way it is readily seen that the Lord's Prayer, like the grand record of creative work in Genesis i., has a perfect number of parts—*i.e.* six; and these six are composed of two triads. The first triad, or first three petitions, are for the greater glory of the Father in heaven; the second triad, or the second three petitions, are for certain mercies for the children on earth. Moreover, the first three are all sentences which commence (in the Greek, and unquestionably in the Aramaic likewise) with *verbs*, and unconnected by the copula "*and*:" the second three, with *the striking and emphatic exception of the first* of them, also begin with *verbs*, but are all three linked together by the copula "*and*." All this is so alike in St. Matthew and in St. Luke; and the arrangement, there is no reason to doubt, is that given by our Lord Himself, and intended by Him to be significant. If this be so, there must exist some special reason for the fact that the clause under discussion is the only *emphatic* sentence in the Prayer, the objective noun "*bread*" being, by a sudden change of order, placed in the forefront before its governing clause "*give us to-day*" (δὸς σήμερον, as rendered by St. Matthew), or "*give us day by day*" (δίδου τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, as rendered by St. Luke, significantly and properly changing the tense of the verb together with the change of the adverb). Moreover, just as *definiteness* is given to the Name, Kingdom, and Will of the Father, by the use of the *article* in the Greek (or the equivalent in the Aramaic), so is *definiteness* given to the bread of the children by the same use. And this *definiteness*, this *distinctive character*, is in the latter case further strengthened, and the general term *bread* narrowed in application by the epexegetical repeated article and adjective following, *i.e.* τὸν ἐπιούσιον. *Bread* it is, yet not every one's bread (hypocrites', heathens', or others'), but already and definitely "*our*" bread; and not even *all* bread that is *ours*, but that particular bread of ours which is *epiousios*. Add to this, that in the context of St. Luke, by means of parables relating to ordinary bread and earthly fathers, our Lord distinctly illustrates and urges the truth that "the *Heavenly Father* will give *the Holy Spirit* to them that ask Him."

And now, at this stage, I must say that I cannot understand how, when all these facts are considered, it can for one moment be deemed a possible or a reverent idea that here in this first emphatic petition for ourselves we are bid to pray each day for the morrow's perishing bread,—on Monday, *e.g.*, for Tuesday's bread,—or how it can be doubted by any one, that, in this clause, with its unique defining and limiting word, ἐπιούσιον, we are introduced to a petition relating to *a mystery;* in other words, that the *bread* for which we are taught to pray in the very first petition for ourselves, brought into special prominence immediately after the petition for the performance of God's will "on earth, even as it is in heaven," and immediately preceding, and closely linked to, petitions for spiritual forgiveness of our past sins, and spiritual grace for the future, is in some sense or other the *spiritual bread*, the *Bread of Life*, the *Living Bread*, the bread which is emphatically "*our*" bread as God's children, and the bread which, from its own peculiar character, could find in the tongues of the nations no adequate term

for its exponent, and needed, as in Eucharistic symbol, some new vehicle for its tradition. The Ancient Fathers must have been right, who, whether they could trace the origin of the mysterious word or not, or grasp its literal meaning, could throw aside the external form and see underneath it the Living Christ, spiritually given and spiritually received by the spiritual children. "*Evermore give us this bread*," is the natural utterance to which, however, as St. John records (vi. 34), Christ mysteriously replies, "*I, Myself, am the Bread of Life.*"

Conclusion. To sum up. A review of all the evidence, from *tradition*, from *etymology*, and from the *setting*, appears to me to establish beyond all reasonable doubt whatever, (*a*) that the original word used by our Lord was the Aramaic מָחָר, *to-morrow*, applied in its wide sense, and purposely used to convey important spiritual teaching as to the *abiding life*, and that bread which "*perisheth not*;" (*b*) that the Greek rendering of this word, which no evangelist or catechist ever presumed to alter, was from the first ἐπιούσιον, and adopted from the participial form of the verb ἐπιέναι, without any reference to οὐσία, *substance*; and (*c*) that the signification of this word, alike from the Aramaic original, the Greek etymology, and the oldest tradition, and in accordance with the remarkable emphasis of setting and context, is *of the morrow* —that is to say, *of the future day* or *future age*, in reference to the *spiritual life* and the *life which is to come*. On the other hand, it is now quite clear that the word "*daily*" neither suggests any probable Aramaic vernacular, nor answers to any etymology of the Greek rendering, nor adequately suits the circumstances of the petition. It fails in every direction, and the accuracy of the Revised Version in this, as in so many other particulars, fails with it.

Bishop Lightfoot, as above noted, set himself to prove (*a*) that the derivation from ἡ ἐπιοῦσα, as the temporal *coming day*, was supported by the oldest tradition; and (*b*) that "the familiar rendering '*daily*,' which has prevailed uninterruptedly in the Western Church from the beginning, is therefore a fairly adequate representation of the original." But the evidence incontestably establishes the *very reverse*, viz. (*a*) that (as Suicer rightly held) every exposition of the oldest tradition, without exception (those referring to οὐσία being, of course, out of the question), distinctly refers that tradition to the *future age*, not to the single temporal *coming day*; and (*b*) that the Western familiar rendering '*daily*,' while itself either no rendering or a mis-rendering of the original Aramaic and Greek, has only prevailed even in the West in a sense *exactly opposite and repugnant* to that for which Bishop Lightfoot contended—that is to say, it prevailed only in its natural and proper English sense of *belonging to to-day*, the literal *present current day*, and *not* in Bishop Lightfoot's unnatural sense of the literal *coming day*; which latter sense, moreover, was expressly regarded by the Fathers as contrary to our Lord's command to "*have no anxious care for the morrow*."

As, then, "*to-day*" in scriptural language metaphorically refers to the whole of this *present life* (cf. also Heb. iii. 13), so does "*to-morrow*" metaphorically refer to the *life to come*. The first-fruits of the future blessings may be tasted and enjoyed now. In this petition, accordingly, we are taught by our Lord, as we have at length seen, to subordinate and forget the perishing things of earth and sense—the Father, unasked, will provide for them—and to uplift the heart to the heavenly and the spiritual, craving for the soul to feed only on her life-giving Saviour, till the dawn of "*the eternal morrow*," and the advent of the full fruition.

Fidelity to our Lord's own word and teaching compels us to abandon the familiar rendering of *daily*, however naturally dear and hallowed from old associations; and, though substitution be now difficult, even with a firm apprehension of the teaching, yet perhaps the best course to adopt is, after all, the simplest, viz. to retain, as from Christ's own lips, the word *to-morrow*, and with the deep spiritual meaning of the phrase ever before us, and devoutly impatient of delay, to pray

"*Give us to-day our morrow's bread!*" [1]

The petition, *thus* phrased, reverently follows close upon the preceding petitions for the Father's glory, and to it may reverently be linked the succeeding petitions for our own forgiveness of sins and preservation from temptation: and "the Lord's Prayer," from beginning to end, in every petition, thus glows with the fervour of the Eternal Spirit and the radiation of the future glory.

[1] If it is desired to retain the emphatic order of the original for the word "bread," then an accurate and suitable and not unrhythmical rendering would be, "*Our bread of the world to come give us to-day.*"

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

The Expository Times for June will contain four examination papers, two on Genesis and two on Ephesians, as already announced since December. In order to give time for the revisal of the work prescribed, as well as to leave room for some very important articles which the June number will contain, expositions are not asked this month.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xv. 20–22.

"But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of them that are asleep. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (R.V.).

Exposition.

"*Now*," not with a temporal but a logical meaning, as in 1 Cor. xiii. 13.—*Ellicott.* "But now, as the case really stands."—*Meyer.*

"*From the dead.*" These words prove that Paul is thinking of a bodily resurrection; for, spiritually, Christ never was among the dead.—*Godet.*

"*The firstfruits.*" The expression is Jewish; and to discover what it implies, we must remember the ancient custom. The firstfruits of the harvest were dedicated to God, whereby He put in His claim for the whole, just as shutting up a road once a year puts in a claim of proprietorship to the right of way for ever. It was thus St. Paul understood the ceremony; "for if the firstfruits be holy, the lump is also holy." Thus when the Apostle says that Christ is the firstfruits of them that are asleep, he implies that part of the harvest has been claimed for God, and therefore that the rest is His too. The resurrection of Christ is the pledge of the resurrection of all who share in His humanity.—*F. W. Robertson.*

"*The firstfruits of them that are asleep*," that is, of all departed saints from Adam to the Advent. The writer's mind leaps forward to the Parousia, and glances back through the ages. The phrase "fallen asleep," always in the New Testament, denotes the death of believers.—*Evans.*

"*Since*," that is, *because*, "by man came death, by man came (must come) also the resurrection of the dead." For it is necessary that we be redeemed and raised as *men*, along the lines of our humanity; and for this purpose he who executes it must be truly human. Thus only is the hereditary principle, the most essential characteristic of our nature, retained.—*W. Milligan.*

"*By* man:" but "*in* Adam . . . *in* Christ." We die *by means of* Adam, because we are *in* Adam; and we live *by means of* Christ, because we are *in* Christ. Union with Adam is the cause of death; union with Christ is the cause of life. In both cases it is at once a representative and a vital union. We are in Adam because he is our head and representative, and because we partake of his nature. And we are in Christ because He is our head and representative, and because we partake of His nature through the indwelling of His Spirit.—*Hodge.*

"*As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*" Are the two clauses equally extensive? The most natural meaning is that in both clauses the word "all" refers to the whole race of men. But we are bound to take into consideration the context, the whole thought which is in the writer's mind at the moment. Now the verb which he employs—"shall be made alive"—admits of but one interpretation, "shall be made alive with spiritual and eternal life." It is never used in the New Testament to signify simply "be raised from the grave." If, then, the "all" in this clause is as universal as the "all" is supposed to be in the first, the Apostle says that every man without exception, having died in "the Adam," shall be saved with the full Messianic salvation in "the Christ,"—a statement so unrestricted that universalists themselves cannot accept it.

But what is the particular point of view from which the Apostle treats his subject? He sees before him two different heads, the Adam and the Christ, each with his own race of descendants, all in the Adam, and all in the Christ. There is a bond of connection between these heads and their descendants, whereby the latter partake of everything contained in the former. He beholds two great companies marshalled before his eye, possessed of entirely different characteristics, and involved in entirely different fates. On the one hand there is the whole human family, on the other are all who are raised in glory; of those raised not in glory, but in shame, he does not for an instant think. There is no trace of them in the whole passage. He sees the two companies above mentioned, and them alone; and, looking at them, he describes the condition of "all" of the one as death in the Adam, and that of "all" of the other as life in the Christ. We have only to work ourselves into the Apostle's method of isolating the thought with which he deals at any particular moment from every other, however related to it, in order to see that the two "alls" need not be absolutely coextensive. They are equally coextensive in the only light in which it concerns him at present to regard them.—*W. Milligan.*

Throughout this whole chapter it is of believers only that St. Paul is thinking, and of them only are many of his assertions true. This limitation

of view is very conspicuous in verse 43; for none can say that the lost will rise *in glory and power*. And it is suggested at once by the words "*they that are Christ's*" in verse 23.—*Beet.*

CRITICAL NOTES.

The verb ζωοποιηθήσονται ("shall be made alive") *cannot* mean simply "shall be raised from the grave." It will admit of but one interpretation, "shall be made alive with spiritual and eternal life." Not only its connection with ζωή, but the fact that it bears this signification in every passage, in which, when applied to persons, it occurs in the New Testament (John v. 21, vi. 63; Rom. iv. 17, viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Gal. iii. 21) is conclusive upon the point.—*W. Milligan.*

"As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." As to the scope of the word "all" in the second clause, consult especially—

Godet's *Commentary in loc.*
Ellicott's *Commentary in loc.*
W. Milligan, *The Monthly Interpreter*, vol. iii. pp. 297–304.
Samuel Cox, *The Resurrection*, pp. 60–84.
R. W. Harden, *Shall All be made Alive?*

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Christ Risen—the Firstfruits of them that Sleep.

By the Rev. R. S. Candlish, D.D.

It is not said anywhere in Scripture that the resurrection of the dead generally is a consequence of the resurrection of Christ. It is not the mere fact that the dead are to rise again that is connected with the fact of Christ having risen. His resurrection is simply the cause and condition of their resurrection, being not a resurrection of damnation, but a resurrection of life, blessedness, and glory. Believers are by grace in Christ, as "the firstfruits of them that sleep," in the same sense as they are naturally in Adam, in whom they sinned and with whom they fell. The two economies have two features in common—representation and union.

1 *Representation:* "By man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." It is by a representative man that death reaches us; it is by a representative man that the resurrection of life awaits us. In both cases this representative man is constituted by God. It is an act of mere sovereignty on God's part, of which no other account can be given except that it is the Divine will.

2. *Union:* "*in* Adam . . . *in* Christ." Those here spoken of (namely, believers in Christ) are all *in* Adam, and therefore they all die; they are all *in* Christ, and therefore they shall all be made alive. They are in Adam, not only as being represented by Adam, but as being partakers of his nature, inheritors of the loss and damage his nature sustained when he fell. They are in Christ, not only as being represented by Christ, but also as becoming one with Him, partakers of His nature; associated with Him in His relation to the Father; in His righteousness, life, and glory.

II.

The Power of the Resurrection.

By the Rev. W. Archer Butler, D.D.

1. The resurrection of Christ is the great public manifestation of His authority over the power of physical decay and death. This it is because it is His own personal conquest. If others have been raised, it has been by a power from without.

2. The self-resurrection of Christ is exercised for the benefit of those He came to redeem. There is a progressive scale in the resurrections described in the Gospels. Jairus' daughter was just dead, the young man was carried out to burial. Lazarus was four days dead. But it is after Christ's resurrection that the fulness of triumph over death is seen. The "saints" who rose were of remote ages, their bodies long since corrupted, and yet *their bodies*, it is expressly stated, arose.

3. Since Christ's departure His resurrection power is not ceased, but seen in fullest action. The Church is "His body," the spiritual result and continual evidence of His physical resurrection. He rises again in every new-born child of God.

4. We must still look forward to the final consummation of the resurrection work of Christ, the restoration of an immortal body to an immortal soul.

III.

The Solidarity of Salvation.

By the Rev. Canon Scott Holland, M.A.

A man whom we know, a friend whom we love,—how distinct, and separate, and individual seems to us all that he says and all that he does! It is the incessant discovery of this uniqueness that makes the charm of a friendship. But let us go to his home, we discover that that look in his eyes belongs to his father, there is his mother in that turn of the mouth, in that shade of colour in the hair. At last we note the flavour of his birth, the breath of his home in everything he says or does.

And yet his own character, his peculiar distinctness, is as real and unwavering and delightful to us as ever. Searching deeper we find that his county has impressed its characteristics on his figure and face; his character, his mind have their roots in the national soil to which he belongs; his decisions are the decisions at which an Englishman and no other could arrive. Nor does the discovery stop here. Science passes with swift foot from shore to shore, from century to century; and in every land, at every period, she finds traces of yet deeper communications that pass out of the entire human race and the entire human story into the heart of every separate man and woman. And yet we are ourselves, we miss nothing of our own free manhood.

It is by this unity of race that we effect a combined advance; civilisation is only possible, because the genius of each generation can be retained and transmitted.

But heredity has its losses as well as its gains. By the same law we all, in Adam, die. Let Adam once have sinned, and we have the seeds of sin within us. We start with an inherited loss. The laws by which this is necessitated are the laws by which we are men. They are the laws by which we advance to civilised blessing, and we cannot repudiate them if they convey to us the witness of a guilty stock.

But the same laws open up the possibility of a redemption. This is the method of God, to turn the conditions of the curse into the very instruments of the blessing. If by these methods sin has abounded, by the same methods grace shall much more abound. But what a task the Redeemer has before Him! His virtue must lay hold of the entire sum of man's being. It must involve itself by roots as deep and strong and clinging as those by which sin has dug its dire fangs into the inherited flesh.

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

The resurrection of others, such as Lazarus, which occurred before the resurrection of Jesus, ought to present no difficulty. They returned into their mortal life to die again; Christ rose into the spiritual life, which cannot die.—*Edwards.*

In Lazarus we behold simply the *reanimation* of the natural body, and the resumption of the fleshly life. In Christ we behold *resurrection* of the spiritual body, and assumption of the life of the world to come.—*J. M. Whiton.*

We murmur our complaints against the death that is ours through Adam, as if death were all that our corporate unity with mankind had brought us. Yet if God is to be judged, let the death incurred under original sin be set parallel with the life involved and inherited under the covenant of Jesus.—*H. S. Holland.*

If it is true that in Christ crucified we behold mankind condemned, it is no less true that in Christ risen we behold mankind justified. If it is we who are dead in Him in our guilt, must it not also be we who in Him are risen again absolved? So close is the interweaving which His love has effected between our lot and His, that after our death has become His death on the cross, His life becomes the principle of our life in eternity. Jesus risen, then, personifies humanity rehabilitated. In Him a man, a real man, after having overcome sin by holiness, and disarmed the law by expiation, has overturned the throne of death which had its foundation in the law of sin. A man had placed the sceptre in the hands of the king of terrors; a man also took it from him.—*Godet: New Testament Studies.*

In Christ. Paul is mighty in that word *in*. It is a great word of his, and, like the blood-sprinkled door-posts in Israel, if you press within, you are safe. You will see the flash of the angel's sword, but God will wave him away from you. You will sleep in Christ; and once in, you will need very good reason to lie down and sleep out of Him. What a style Paul has! "To be found in Christ," he says. That means that somebody comes to look for you, to find you outside, and cannot see you; for you are safe within. Death finds you in Christ, and the resurrection, and the judgment.—*Alexander Whyte.*

The Religious Literature of the Month.

MAGAZINES.

The Church Review (New York, 4s.), under the editorship of the Rev. Henry Mason Baum, D.C.L., is conducted with ability and enterprise sufficient to give it a place beside our greatest quarterlies, if we have a quarterly which can stand beside *it*. We cordially recommend it to British readers, who will marvel at the price when they see the wealth of material.

The Magazine of Christian Literature (New York, 1s.), a most welcome addition to our American exchanges, opens with Dr. Selah Merrill's article on "Recent Exploration in Palestine." Among its further contents may be specially mentioned the syllabus of Professor Briggs' recent inaugural lecture on being installed in the Chair of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Besides the lecture itself, there are given the chief criticisms upon it which appeared in the American press.

Amongst the "Notable Sermons of the Month," a place was regularly given to the Dean of Rochester's Addresses on **The Purposes of Lent,** and to Canon Body's Lenten Sermons on **The Life of Contrition,** as published week by week in *Church Bells*. The numbers of *Church Bells* containing both series have been issued as "Special Parts" of that most excellently edited religious weekly (*Church Bells* Office, 7d. each). They are equal to a good volume of sermons, and where can a good volume of sermons be had at the price?

The Modern Church, the new religious weekly for Scotland (Glasgow, 1d.), has commenced with great promise what we sincerely hope may be a long and useful life. The impression made by the first three numbers is that Professor Bruce is resolved to lift up the weekly newspaper into a higher place, and that he has an immense literary and theological strength behind him in this endeavour. Take the third number by itself. The editor's leading article, which discusses the church-going question, is not merely readable. It grapples earnestly with a most pressing problem—more pressing in Scotland, we fear, than Englishmen know—and proposes well-considered measures for its remedy. In Mr. MacEwen's sermon on "Decision for Christ" we miss something, but we are struck with the force and beauty of the rest. Three truths are given as the peculiar glory of Christianity: (1) that Christ was the revealer of God; (2) that Christ was the remover of barriers; (3) that Christ's guidance is a perfect rule of life. It is in the second truth we miss something—Christ was the remover of barriers. "He took away the hindrances caused by our sin and ignorance and mortality, which prevent us from the leading of a divine life. These hindrances are differently defined—the removal of them is differently explained; but that they were there without Christ, and that they have been removed through Christ, is the universal teaching of the Scriptures." That is too meagre for the subject which Mr. MacEwen is on. It is too indefinite for the Scripture teaching. It would have added enormously to the power of the rest, powerful and attractive as the rest of the sermon is, had more weight and greater precision been given to the barriers and their removal. The American letter is perhaps the lightest, the least weighty, thing in the paper. Mr. Adams' article on "The Use of Illustration in Sunday-school Teaching" is quite as interesting, and much more invigorating. The reviews are done by men who know their subject, and they deserve, one and all of them, to be carefully read. Still more instructive is Mr. Ewen's survey of the last issue of the *Revue des Etudes Juives*. And these are but a few of the articles of importance which this number contains. We ought none the less to have mentioned the Rev. D. M. Ross's "Memories of Palestine;" Professor Dods's "Sermon to Boys;" and the "Discussions on the Religion of the Highlands," and the "Position of the Church towards Working-men." It is not easy to drive a team like this. But the most undoubted fact about *The Modern Church* is the vigour and life of its administration. We shall look for subsequent issues with interest and hope.

NOTABLE SERMONS AND EXPOSITIONS IN APRIL.

Gen. i. 12 (Parkhurst), New York Evangelist, 3182.
i. 27 (Selby), Preacher's Magazine.
ii. 22 (Henson), Chicago Standard, 28.
iii. 4 (Talmage), Christian Herald, 14.
Num. vi. 23–27 (Alexander), Guardian, 2364.
xi. 29 (Parker), Christian Commonwealth, 493.
Judges v. 15–17 (Davies), Holland Road Pulpit, 118.
1 Sam. iv. 7 (Parker), Christian Commonwealth, 495.
1 Kings i. 23 (Wood), Baptist Magazine.
vii. 22 (Davis), Homiletic Review.
2 Kings xiii. 20, 21 (Watkinson), Methodist Recorder, 1735.
1 Chron. xi. 18, 19 (Hamilton), Treasury.
2 Chron. i. 3, iii. 1 (Whitelaw), Theological Monthly.
Ps. xviii. 35 (Pearse), Preacher's Magazine.
xxix. 2 (Parsons), Literary Churchman, 7.
xxxiv. 6, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2193.
xlii. xliii. (Nordell), Old and New Testament Student.
civ. (Chambers), Homiletic Review.
cv. 17–19 (Goodman), Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.
cxxxix. 23 (Dale), Evangelical Magazine.
Canticles v. 2 (Jones), Sunday at Home.
Isa. xxi. 11, 12 (Henrey), Church of England Pulpit, 797.
xxvii. 3 (Macmillan), Quiver.
xxxii. 2, 3 (Stalker), Christian Leader, 484.
xliv. 1, 2 (Stalker), Treasury.
Hosea xiv. 1–3, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2192.
Matt. vi. 24 (Davidson), Christian Million, 389.
xxi. 9, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2196.
xxviii. 9 (Maclaren), Freeman, 1887.
Mark xiii. 32 (Moorhouse), Church of England Pulpit, 795.
xvi. 3 (Thorold), News, 805.
Luke vi. 48, 49 (Murphy), Church of England Pulpit, 797.
ix. 48 (Cox), Sunday Magazine.
xiv. 21, 22 (Matheson), Modern Church, 1.
John iv. 7, 26 (Maclaren), Freeman, 1886.
viii. 28 (Meyer), Christian, 1103, 1104.
viii. 31, 32 (Brooks), American Churchman, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409.
xv. 11, Primitive Methodist Magazine.
xix. 25 (Hunter), Christian Leader, 483.
xx. 19 (Maclaren), Freeman, 1887.
xxi. 18, 19 (Maclaren), Homiletic Review.
Acts iv. 23 (Stone), Sword and Trowel.
xxvi. 8 (Thorold), Good Words.
Rom. iii. 20, 31 (Holland), Cambridge Review, 298.
x. 6–9 (Burdick), New York Evangelist, 3181.
1 Cor. viii. (Vincent), Magazine of Christian Literature.
xiii. 11, 12 (Cholmondeley), Theological Monthly.
xv. 20 (Senior), Fireside.
Gal. vi. 7 (Banford), Quiver.
Col. iii. 1 (Smith), Modern Church, 2.
iii. 1–9 (Paterson), Word and Work, 838.
iii. 3 (Cobb), Church Times, 1471.
1 Tim. vi. 20 (Potter), American Churchman, 2409.
2 Tim. ii. 14, 15 (Macdonald), Methodist Recorder, 1737.
iii. 16, 17 (Denney), British Weekly, 230.
Heb. ix. 11, 12 (Body), Church Bells, 1057; Church Times, 1470.
James i. 10, 11 (Cox), Expositor.
ii. 20 (Talmage), Primitive Methodist World, 430.
1 Pet. i. 5 (Stuart), Churchman's Magazine.
iii. 4 (Hunter), Modern Church, 1.
iv. 6 (Wotherspoon), Homiletic Review.
Rev. ii. 18–29 (Urquhart), King's Own.
xviii. 13 (Hughes), Methodist Times, 325.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Canon Cheyne contributes to this number of The Expository Times the first of a short series of articles upon "Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Israel." The subject, at first sight appearing somewhat technical, if not even fanciful, is thoroughly removed from both fancy and mere technicality, first by the broad human treatment of it in Canon Cheyne's hands, and, secondly, by its intimate bearing upon questions of living biblical interest, especially upon the problems which surround the Psalms. Canon Cheyne's *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms* will shortly be published. They are sure to attract widespread attention; and it is the author's wish that these articles should appear and be read before the lectures, as in some sense an introduction to them. Moreover, we are soon to hear more of the Parsis and their religion. M. James Darmesteter has chosen this as the subject of the next course of Hibbert Lectures.

The July number will contain an account of the remarkable articles which have appeared in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, by Professor Klostermann of Kiel, on the Old Testament criticism. By a skilful use of the lower or textual criticism, Professor Klostermann is believed to have given the higher criticism the greatest shake that it has yet received.

With the issue this month of the second volume, Professor Swete has completed the Cambridge *Old Testament in Greek* (two vols., crown 8vo, pp. 828, 880, 7s. 6d. each). The number of books that are indispensable is really very small, but for the study of the Old Testament a good copy of the Septuagint is absolutely indispensable; and Professor Swete's edition is, without question, the best. Many years hence we are promised a larger edition, with extended *apparatus criticus;* but this edition is altogether so satisfactory for the working student's ends and purposes, and it has been placed so thoroughly within reach by the generous enterprise of the University Press, that few of us need wait the appearance of the larger edition, or lament that it is beyond acquisition when it does appear. The book, as we have it, is the result of a marvellous perseverance and most conscientious scholarship. It is quite worthy to stand beside Westcott and Hort's *Greek New Testament.*

Professor Swete's Septuagint is itself part of a wider movement. The signs are now become very clear that in all future study of the Old Testament, the non-Hebrew Versions will hold a position of much greater influence than heretofore. And the first and most needful step is the possession of a critical edition. In the current issue of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, Professor H. P. Smith pleads for such an edition of the Vulgate also, as the indispensable preliminary to the use of that version. Meantime it has become imperative upon men who are neither skilled linguists nor professed exegetes that they should know something of the history and character of, at least, the greatest of the versions. We hope to be able to publish a series of articles, written by

scholars who have made special study of the subject. The first, an introductory paper by Professor Kennedy, will be found in this number. Professor Swete will shortly contribute another on the Old Latin Version. That which may seem to some of us uninteresting and out of the way will speedily—as acquaintance ripens, and we perceive how much light the subject throws upon current Old Testament discussions,—become interesting enough and full of practical stimulus. It is this kind of reading that makes the full man, and the full man is the greatest preacher and the best hearer.

Professor J. F. M'Curdy, of University College, Toronto, contributes an article to the *Knox College Monthly* for March on three recent commentaries on Isaiah—Delitzsch, Orelli, and Smith. He holds that the chief merits of Mr. Smith's book are two: the use which it makes of the historical element in Isaiah, and its persistent demonstration that to understand Isaiah the book, we must understand Isaiah the man. His appreciation of Delitzsch as a commentator is very high, but also marked by the discrimination of a scholar. "Probably no commentator of the age," he says, "brought so many gifts to the interpretation of the Bible as did Franz Delitzsch. Chief among these are his ability and penetration, his originality and acuteness of thought, his abundant and various learning in all departments of research that bear upon the Old Testament, his open eye for all that can shed light upon doubtful passages or illustrate half-hidden beauties of phrase or allusion, and the genial faculty, more spiritual than intellectual, that enabled him to gather up all the meaning of a passage, and show its place and bearing in the divine order and substance of revelation. Walking hand in hand with such a guide through the Garden of the Lord, one can not only gather its ripened fruit, but also breathe the fragrance of its flowers and gaze upon their loveliness."

But Professor M'Curdy admits the necessity of some preparation on the part of the student if Delitzsch is to be fully enjoyed. He asks, Why should not every student be *trained* to follow such a master? Then even the condensation of the style so characteristic of Delitzsch, which makes rapid reading impossible, becomes no hindrance, but rather a positive gain, since it compels young students to closeness of attention and sympathy with the full mind and concentrated earnestness of the interpreter. Meantime, till this is accomplished, he recommends most strongly the commentary by Orelli as easier, shorter, more concerned with results than processes, and more accessible.

"In Christianity, as a formulated system, there are three main elements:—(1) The common foundation of Hebrew religion as contained in the Old and New Testaments, but primarily in the Old; (2) a specially Christian element, which is due to the life and work of Christ; (3) certain peculiar forms of expression, gradually determined upon after six centuries of keen controversy, which are, to a large extent, of Greek origin. . . . At the present moment, attention is being turned in full stream upon the first of these sources. It is likely also, if I am not mistaken, to be directed shortly to the third." Professor Sanday is the sober and responsible seer who commits himself to that prediction. As yet the signs of its fulfilment are as feeble as they are few. The problems of the Old Testament are absorbing the interest of constantly increasing numbers of Christian people. Few of us have yet discovered the existence of a problem in early Christianity which has any claim upon our attention.

Yet if it is to become a controversy in our midst, it is likely to prove the most momentous of our day. Its issues are nearer and more personal than those which belong to the discussions of which the Old Testament is the centre; its conditions will be more intelligible to the popular mind; its issues more vital to the existing doctrine and practice of the Christian Church. Not one, but every Christian community amongst us will be affected by it; though, if the late Dr. Hatch has correctly sketched its outline, the chief gain will belong to the Quakers, and the High Church will be most seriously shaken and removed.

The contention is that much of modern theology, and even of modern Christian practice, is non-

scriptural. It originated in the early Christian centuries, and chiefly in Asia Minor. Partly, it sprang from the necessity for more explicit and minute definition which the early heresies forced upon the Church, but mainly from the transference of Christianity from Palestine to Asia Minor, and its contact there with the modes of thought and religious observance of pagan Greece. "I venture to claim," says Dr. Hatch, as he gathers up the results of his Hibbert Lectures—"I venture to claim to have shown that a large part of what are sometimes called Christian doctrines, and many usages which have prevailed, and continue to prevail, in the Christian Church, are, in reality, Greek theories and Greek usages, changed in form and colour by the influence of primitive Christianity, but in their essence Greek still."

Unless Dr. Hatch is, indeed, the dreamer of dreams which he expects to be called, there is here a Greek question of a more vital order than the retention or rejection of the Greek Grammar at our schools and colleges. By a vote of assembled head-masters, Plato may cease to interfere with the claims of football; but what assembly will be sufficient to remove his influence from the Christian creed and the exercises of Christian worship? "I believe," says Dr. Hatch, "the consideration of this question, and practical action in the determination of it, to be the work that lies before the theologians of our generation." It is extremely doubtful if it will be left to the theologians to settle. Earnest men who are not professed theologians will soon discover the vital importance of it. The Churches will demand from specialists the materials of the problem; they will settle the problem themselves.

In the Hibbert Lectures of 1888, recently published under the direction of Principal Fairbairn (Williams & Norgate, 8vo, 1890, 10s. 6d.), the late Dr. Hatch has indicated the general lines along which these materials must be gathered. He has himself gathered some of the materials. They are more largely doctrinal than practical; but in order to show the nature of the points at issue, it will be easier to separate an article of religious observance, and the Sacrament of Baptism may be chosen for the purpose.

In the earliest times (1) baptism followed at once upon conversion; (2) the ritual was of the simplest kind, nor does it appear that it needed any special minister. Both points are shown by the Acts of the Apostles. These were the simple elements of early Christian baptism. When it emerges after a period of obscurity—like a river which flows under the sand — the enormous changes of later times have already begun. The first point of change is the change of *name*. Three of these new names are mentioned—"enlightenment," which is found as early as the time of Justin Martyr, and which became the constant technical term for baptism; "seal," which was used partly of those who had passed the preliminary tests, and partly of those who were actually sealed in the forehead in token of a new ownership; and "mystery," a most significant term, as shall be seen immediately. The second point is the change of *time*. Instead of being given immediately upon conversion, baptism came to be in all cases postponed by a long period of preparation, and in some cases deferred to the end of life. Christians were accordingly separated into two classes, those who had and those who had not been baptized. The word which distinguished the baptized person from the unbaptized is immediately derived from the word "mystery"—they were *led into the mystery*. These are the broad features of the change. There are other points, of slighter importance in themselves, but significant enough in their bearing on the whole problem. Thus (*a*) the catechumen, as the period of his training drew to a close, received a "password" which consisted of the baptismal formula itself and the Lord's Prayer; (*b*) sometimes the baptized person received the communion at once after baptism; (*c*) he was sometimes crowned with a garland; (*d*) baptism was often administered in the evening under a blaze of artificial light; and (*e*) baptism was administered, not at any place or time, but only in the great Churches, and only as a rule once a year, the primitive "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" passing into an elaborate ritualistic service.

What is the explanation of these far-reaching changes? They are due, says Dr. Hatch, to the fact that Christianity had got planted in the land of the Greek mysteries and had passed into the hands of men, many of whom had been initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries, with the elaborate ritual of which they were more familiar than with the simplicity of scriptural doctrine and practice. "During the earliest centuries of Christianity the mysteries, and other religious societies which were akin to the mysteries, existed in an enormous scale throughout the eastern part of the empire. There were elements in some of them from which Christianity recoiled, and against which the Christian Apologists use the language of strong invective. But, on the other hand, the majority of them had the same aims as Christianity itself—the aim of worshipping a pure God, the aim of living a pure life, and the aim of cultivating the spirit of brotherhood. They were part of a great religious revival which distinguished the age. It was inevitable when a new group of associations came to exist side by side with a large body of existing associations, from which it was continually detaching members, introducing them into its own midst with the practices of their original societies impressed upon their minds, that this new group should tend to assimilate, with the assimilation of their members, some of the elements of these existing groups. This is what we find to have been in fact the case."

Accordingly the new names which are found attached to baptism are derived, Dr. Hatch believes, from the Greek mysteries. "Enlightenment," "seal," and especially the great term "mystery" itself, are explicable only through ideas and usages peculiar to the mystery cult. Unknown to the Apostolic Church, they are well-known to those initiated in the mysteries. Again, the giving to the catechumens of a formula or password belongs to the Eleusinian rites, from which the name for password (*symbolon*) directly comes, a name used for a creed to the present day. So also the baptized received the communion at once after baptism, just as those who had been initiated at Eleusis proceeded at once—after a day's fast—to drink of the mystic *kykeon*, and to eat of the sacred cakes. And so on through the elaborate range of doctrine and ritual, much of which has been incorporated in the creeds, and remains the believed and practised possession of the Churches to-day.

It is manifest that there is here abundance of material for Dr. Sanday's prophecy. And it will not do to ignore either the author or the book. In an article contributed to the current number of the *Contemporary Review*, Professor Sanday says of the author: "The world knows what it has lost in Dr. Hatch. It is needless now to lay stress on his wide learning, his breadth of view, the freshness and independence which he brought to bear on every subject which he took up, his thorough scientific method, and his remarkable powers of clear and forcible expression. If any one of the German specialists were asked who were our foremost writers on early ecclesiastical history, he would probably name Dr. Hatch, Mr. Gwatkin, and Bishop Lightfoot; and, regarding Bishop Lightfoot rather as a masterly editor of patristic texts than as a historian, strictly so called, he would be pretty sure to give the first place to Dr. Hatch." And, further on, he says of the book itself: "I doubt whether so important a contribution has been made to the real understanding of the first three centuries within our memory."

It is not surprising, therefore, that already the Bampton lecturer for the present year has sounded the note of opposition. Mr. Gore made Dr. Hatch's book the subject of his fourth lecture, delivered at Oxford on the 19th April. Mr. Gore admits a difference in the theology of the creeds from that of the New Testament. But the theology of the creeds is not an accretion from without, but a direct development of New Testament doctrine. There is such a development visible in the New Testament itself. Mr. Gore regards it as the great defect of the Hibbert Lectures, that they take the Sermon on the Mount as the sum and substance of New Testament doctrine, ignoring the theology of the apostolic epistles. On these lines we may expect that the criticism of Dr. Hatch's book will run.

The Early Narratives of Genesis.

By the Rev. Professor Herbert E. Ryle, M.A., Cambridge.

II.

THE ASSYRIAN COSMOGONY AND THE DAYS OF CREATION.

The subjects of discussion in the present paper are the relation of the Hebrew to the Assyrian cosmogony, and the interpretation of the "Days" of Creation. It is not for a moment to be supposed that it would be possible to compress an adequate treatment of topics of such magnitude within the narrow limits of a single article. Completeness is out of the question. Our aim is only to present, with as much clearness as possible, the line of interpretation which results from the principles laid down in a previous number (April) of The Expository Times.

1. The Assyrian Cosmogony.

We might easily be beguiled into a path that would lead us far away from our immediate purpose if we attempted to examine the relationship of the Hebrew narrative of the Creation to the similar narratives preserved in the religious literature of other races. To the student of Comparative Religion the task involved in such an inquiry is one of peculiar fascination. The field of research is wide and constantly widening. The workers in it are as yet few; the work itself has only in recent years been set on foot. To the biblical student such investigations cannot fail to be helpful and suggestive. They serve to gather together into a focus those gleams, whether of the true perception or of the surviving recollection, of The Light, which seem to be the common heritage of all races, and which help to remind us that God left not Himself without a witness among the nations of the world. In spite of this, however, the results of a comparative study of the cosmogonies of the races would only indirectly assist the interpretation of Gen. i.–ii. 4. It must therefore suffice to be reminded, at this point, of the endless variety of picture in which the problem of the origin of the universe has received a solution from the religious conceptions and from the poetical imaginations of races so varied as Indians and Etruscans, Germans and Egyptians, Norsemen, Mexicans, and Greeks.

But we must make one exception. In the religious literature of Assyria, we find a cosmogony which, in some respects, stands in a different category from those of the races just mentioned. From whatever point of view it is approached, its direct bearing upon the narrative of Gen. i. must be admitted, and account taken of it. It offers us another representation of the story of the Creation, preserved in the literature of another branch of the same great Semitic family from which the people of Israel sprang. The points of resemblance between the Assyrian and the Hebrew narratives force themselves upon our notice. But it must also be allowed that the points of their dissimilarity are not less obvious. Whatever estimate be formed of the Assyrian tradition as a whole, its Semitic origin, the antiquity of its documentary history, the degree of its approximation to the Genesis narrative in some points, of its divergency from it in others, afford reasons that cannot be overlooked for including a notice of the Assyrian cosmogony in any careful interpretation of this passage of Scripture.

Until quite recently our knowledge of the Assyrian Creation narrative was derived from the fragments of Berosus, the Babylonian historian (circ. 250 B.C.), preserved in the writings of Josephus, Syncellus, and Eusebius, and from allusions to it in the works of the Neo-Platonist Damascius (circ. 530 A.D.) Into these representations of the Babylonian cosmogony it was thought probable that a good deal of more recent, exotic, and, in particular, of Hellenic, growth had been grafted.

But the success of the late eminent Assyreologist, Mr. George Smith, in deciphering the cuneiform inscriptions on the mutilated fragments of what are now sometimes called the Creation Tablets,

threw an unexpected light upon the Assyrian legend. These precious fragments had been brought to the British Museum along with other treasures of the famous library of Assurbanipal (668–626 B.C.), excavated at Kouyunjik. The date of Assurbanipal is, comparatively speaking, late. But the contents of his library probably reproduced the traditions of a very much earlier time. There is good reason to suppose that even if the tablets themselves were inscribed in Assurbanipal's reign, the narrative which they preserve is substantially the same as had been preserved from the Assyrian religious literature of a much earlier century.

The form in which it was committed to these tablets was that of a great epic poem. Its contents are now widely known through the pages of such works as Sayce's *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* (translated by Prof. O. C. Whitehouse), and *Records of the Past* (edited by Sayce), 2nd series, vol. i. pp. 122–153. About one-third of the poem is still missing, but the general outline of the narrative is unmistakable. It describes the Creation as taking place in seven creative acts. These are recorded in seven books or tablets, of which the second and sixth are wanting. From the first tablet we learn that in the beginning there existed only "watery chaos" (*Tiamat*), out of which sprang the primal gods "Lakhmu" and "Lakhamu," then "Ansar" and "Kisar," the upper and lower firmament, and then the Assyrian gods, Anu, god of the sky; Bel, or Illil, god of the spirit-world; and Ea, god of waters. The third and fourth tablets record the creation of light, which was represented in the victory of Merodach, son of Ea, god of light, over Tiamat, while out of the skin of the slaughtered Tiamat was constructed the wide expanse of the heavens, the dwelling-place of the Assyrian gods. The fifth tablet tells how the sun and moon and stars were implanted in the sky, and received divine command to regulate the succession of times and seasons, of days and years. The sixth tablet, which has not yet been found, must have recorded the formation of the earth and the creation of the vegetable world, of birds and fishes. The seventh and last tablet tells how the cattle and the larger beasts, and all creeping things, were made. Unfortunately, the latter part is much mutilated, and the description of the formation of man has not survived.

In spite of the wholly different setting which is here given to the story of the Creation, "the Assyrian epic," to quote Professor Sayce's own words, "bears a striking resemblance to the account of it given in the first chapter of Genesis. In each case the history of the Creation is divided into seven successive acts; in each case the present world has been preceded by a watery chaos. In fact, the self-same word is used of this chaos in both the biblical and Assyrian accounts—*tehôm*, *Tiamat*,—the only difference being that in the Assyrian story "the deep" has become a mythological personage, the mother of a chaotic brood. The order of the Creation, moreover, agrees in the two accounts: first the light, then the creation of the firmament of heaven, subsequently the appointment of the celestial bodies "for signs and for seasons, and for days and years," and next the creation of beasts and creeping things" (*Records of the Past*, 2nd series, i. 130).

On the other hand, the points of difference are equally conspicuous. In the Assyrian account the creation of light is the result of a conflict between a deity and chaos; in Genesis it is called into being by the word of God. In the Assyrian account the heavenly bodies are allotted their place before the formation of the earth; in Genesis the dry land appears before the sun and moon and stars are set in the sky. In the Assyrian account the seventh "tablet" is occupied with a description of creative work; in Genesis the seventh day is a day of rest. Most striking of all is the contrast between the polytheism of the Assyrian account and the majestic simplicity of the monotheism of Genesis. In the Assyrian account, gods as well as universe emerge from pre-existent chaos, and the work of creation proceeds by the triumph of divine power over the forces of matter inherently evil. In Genesis, God (*Elohim*) creates whatever has come into being by the utterance of His will—all is from the beginning His handiwork, and in its essence is very good.

Before we endeavour to determine the relation of the Hebrew to the Assyrian narrative, it is important to mention the existence of yet another Assyrian cosmogony brought to light in the fragments of two tablets which had also belonged to

the library of Assurbanipal. These were copied from even older sources obtained from Cutha in Babylonia, which Professor Sayce conjectures can hardly have been later than 2350 B.C. In the Cuthaean legend we have no account of an orderly succession of creative acts. The children of Chaos or Tiamat who dwelt underground are destroyed by Nergal, the god of Cutha, and after their overthrow he creates the children of men.

Placing the two Assyrian legends of the Creation side by side, we should be inclined to surmise that, in remote times, there existed in Assyria several varying traditions respecting the Creation; but that, in later times, under the influence of a more systematic theology or a more philosophic religion, the various legends received a final form in the grouping of the seven tablets of the Creation; the number "seven" being probably selected because it was a holy number in Assyria.

What, then, are we to say was the connection of the Genesis with the Assyrian cosmogony? It did not originate the Assyrian narrative; of that we may be confident. For the earlier legend that was current before the days of Abraham bears no resemblance to the Genesis cosmogony, while the later one, which does resemble the Genesis cosmogony, seems to have originated in a period when Hebrew religious thought could not conceivably have influenced Assyrian.

On the other hand, the Assyrian may have originated the Hebrew cosmogony; and, if so, would have given rise to it either directly and at a recent time, or only indirectly and ultimately. Certain critics have of late advocated the former alternative. They call attention to the fact that, with the exception of Exod. xx. 11, the references to Gen. i.–ii. 4, to be found in passages of undoubtedly pre-exilic date, are few and disputable; and they conjecture that the Jews brought back from their exile in Babylon this form of the Assyrian cosmogony adapted to their own religious use. The evidence for this supposition appears to me, so far as I have been able to form any judgment upon the matter, to be quite insufficient. Even apart from considerations of Higher Criticism, the great improbability that the pious Jews of the exile would ever have adopted the Creation narrative of their hated heathen captors is almost sufficient in itself to condemn the theory. On the other hand, the probability that the Genesis cosmogony is *ultimately* to be traced back to an Assyrian tradition may be reasonably admitted. The ancestors of Abraham were Assyrian; whether dwellers of Northern Assyria or Babylonia itself need not here be discussed. The various Creation legends current in Assyria would presumably have been preserved in the clan of Terah, and have been transmitted from generation to generation. If now our supposition is correct that the Assyrian Creation story of the seven tablets marks the orderly grouping characteristic of an age more developed in religious thought, it is reasonable to suppose that a similar and almost parallel process took place in a stock which was an offshoot of Assyria, and which was privileged, in things religious, to receive the guidance of the Divine Spirit in so superlative a degree. Thus the early traditions of the Semitic race were yoked to the service of the spiritual religion of Israel. The essential teaching of Jehovah respecting the Divine nature, the universe, and man's nature, was conveyed in the outline of a cosmogony, which, if it had its roots in the early Assyrian traditions, was finally expressed in all the dignified simplicity of Hebrew monotheism.

2. The Days of Creation.

According to this explanation, the Days of Creation in the Genesis cosmogony are to be understood as literal days; for as such they seem to be intended in the simple Hebrew narrative. At the same time, the spiritual teaching is obvious. The lesson underlying the mention of those seven days is that of the law of ordered progress which, as it were, characterises the dealings of the Divine Creator with created matter. The literal interpretation of the Days of Creation is thus compatible with the spiritual, their origin in popular tradition with their consecration for emblematical instruction. The simple narrative is made the vehicle of revelation respecting the things of the Spirit. But the seal of inspiration affixed to it does not alter the original character of the narrative, nor transform the imagery of the Israelite cosmogony into absolute canons of physical science.

I am well aware that those who have looked for scientific teaching in Gen. i. have not failed

to find it. These may be divided into two main groups according as they apply to the "Days" of Creation a literal or a metaphorical interpretation.

There are not probably many nowadays who would maintain, as once it would have been regarded as profane not to maintain, that this passage of Scripture, literally understood, contains a scientific account of the processes of Creation, which occupied six literal days. But since the time when this view prevailed, the book of Divine Revelation in Nature has been opened more widely and studied more deeply. The writing in that volume has been readily and reverently received by Christendom. Christian thought now gladly welcomes the teaching of the geologist and the astronomer. It recognises as the truth that, according to the working of the Omnipotent Creator's will, gradual change throughout infinite ages must have been the process which governed alike the evolution of sidereal systems, the moulding of the earth's crust, and the appearance of the animal and vegetable kingdoms upon its surface.

If then it was still to be supposed that Gen. i. definitely instructed us in science, some other interpretation of "the days" than the old literal one had to be found. The very discoveries of physical science suggested a solution. If "the days" were understood not as literal days but as infinite ages, or as periods in the development of the earth's formation, then it seemed as if the threatened contradiction of Scripture and science might be averted, and as if the words of Genesis might receive unexpected confirmation from the testimony of science. Accordingly the metaphorical interpretation of "the days" found very general favour. Scholars and men of science have shown how, with allowance for the exigencies of poetic language, the statements of the opening chapter of Genesis may be brought into comparatively close agreement with even the most recent results of scientific inquiry.

But just as, in the earlier phase of interpretation, it was found that, by starting from a literal interpretation, a collision with scientific facts could not be avoided, so now, in the later phase, it was an objection that, starting from the facts of science, it was necessary to have recourse to a forced or, at any rate, a non-literal interpretation. In a passage of striking simplicity of language, it is impossible not to feel an uncomfortable suspicion that it cannot be right to attach a non-literal explanation to just that one single word, the *literal* meaning of which happens to be a stumbling-block in the way of the desired method of exegesis. And surely the doubt, whether this non-literal explanation of "the days" can be correct, will be intensified in the mind of any one who also considers that the proposed explanation could never have suggested itself to the ancient Israelite, and would never to-day have been mooted, but for the discoveries of modern science.

But even the acceptance of this interpretation fails to satisfy fully the demands of scientific facts. To mention but one signal instance, the formation of the heavenly bodies on the fourth day is utterly unscientific, it is at variance with what we, through science, know to have been the actual order of creation. The assertion that not the formation but the first manifestation of the heavenly bodies through the mists that encompassed the earth is indicated in Gen. i. 14, is an explanation of the difficulty too unnatural and forced to merit serious attention.

Perhaps the objections which I here touch on are not felt by very many. But I should be wanting in candour if I did not record my impression, that the endeavour to maintain the scientific accuracy of Gen. i. entails a choice between the natural literal exegesis which defies modern discoveries and the non-natural metaphorical exegesis which is introduced just on account of these modern discoveries, in order to meet the apparent necessity of their claims.

The alternative principle of interpretation which is here preferred is free from both these disadvantages. It is embarrassed by no such dilemma. It starts with the assumption that the Divine Revelation gives us instruction on things spiritual, not on things of natural science. We are then ready, indeed we expect, to find in this fragment of ancient Israelite literature instances of collision with the results of modern science. They mark the interval between the intellectual attainment of the Israelite and the degree of precision obtained in our European learning. The whole passage must be understood as the writer presumably wrote it and his country-

men presumably understood it. To him, as to his countrymen generally, "the days" were literal days as much as "the heavens" were literal heavens and "the light" literal light.

If then we are asked what the scientific value of the chapter is, our reply must be, "As much or as little as impartial men of science recognise in it;" certainly, we should say, less than what it was once reputed to contain, but very possibly more than is now commonly attributed to it. In fairness, too, we should grant that whatever scientific value it possesses, it shares in some measure with the congenital Assyrian tradition, and indeed, though in a less degree, with any analogous cosmogonies, which agree with the Genesis account so far as to assert that the world was made by the exercise of a Supreme Power, that the process of Creation followed an ordered sequence, and that the creation of man marked the highest point in the scale of created being.

We may gladly acknowledge, as has often been claimed for this portion of Scripture, that no other known cosmogony approaches it in its capacity of adaptation to, and even of actual correspondence with, the discoveries of modern science. But were it possible that the well-known difficulties of "the days," the formation of the heavenly bodies, the priority in Creation of vegetable to animal life, and of birds and fishes to reptiles, could be successfully met; were agreement with science a thousand times closer than it is asserted to be, it would fall far short of reconciling us to the thought of the inspiration of Scripture being made the medium of scientific instruction. Paradoxical as it may sound, faith would, I believe, be more genuinely staggered by any perfectly exact agreement in Genesis with the wonderful discoveries of modern science than it ever has been, or is ever likely to be, by the familiar contradictions with science that were to be expected in a literature so ancient, and are to be found in this chapter, according to any literal interpretation.

As a matter of fact, however strongly apologists have pleaded for the "scientific" interpretation of Gen. i., their faith in Christianity has not been affected by the question. People have not lived in any real dread, lest fresh discoveries in science should upset their belief in the reality of Divine Revelation. It has been instinctively felt that the true conception of inspiration was not affected by the advance of material knowledge. The intuitive recognition of the human element in Scripture enabled men to perceive that progress in the knowledge of physical laws constituted no encroachment upon the domain of the spiritual. The readjustment of interpretation satisfies the claims of reason and belief. The primitive tradition is made, through the Divine Spirit, the first step in the stairway of Divine Revelation.

The chief apprehension that has been felt has rightly related to the belief in inspiration. And I venture to plead that the line of interpretation suggested in this and the previous paper, instead of degrading the doctrine, safeguards it from an unworthy and mechanical conception. Popular opinion is tempted to confuse inspiration with the passive receptiveness of religious ecstacy. From the introduction to St. Luke's Gospel, and indeed from the character of both historical and prophetical books of Scripture, we infer that the contents of books of Scripture are the result of patient labour and arduous research, overruled for the Divine purpose and guided by the Holy Spirit. The inspiration which, we believe, breathes through the varied and often secular material of Scripture, selected and collected, *e.g.*, in the chronicles of old times, in bare genealogies, in laws of ritual, in popular sayings, breathes too in those early narratives which in Hebrew, as in other literature, lie at the back of the more strictly historical records.

The common type which the Hebrew shares with the Assyrian cosmogony is patent. But differing from the Assyrian in this respect, the Hebrew narrative has descended to us distinguished with a sobriety, dignity, and elevation communicated to it by those whose spirit had been schooled by the Divine Teacher. Its simple story was dignified to be the messenger of profoundest truths.

On every side from which ideas respecting God and the universe were capable, in those early days, of mean or idolatrous degradation, the Israelite version of the Creation epic is fenced about. Did other nations believe in the pre-existence of matter? Israel received the doctrine of the pre-existence of God. Did they regard matter as essentially evil or as needing to be vanquished by the Deity? Israel learned that there was nothing created which God had not created in its essence good. Had the worship of the heavenly bodies become a common form of misleading idolatry? Israel learned that they were themselves the handiwork of God, and served the supreme purpose in the ordered succession of His creative work. Did some regard man's nature as the offspring of a lower emanation or of some subordinate divinity? Israel learned that man was made by the Most High in His image and in His likeness.

However much its narrative may transcend in verisimilitude the teaching of other cosmogonies in matters of human cognisance, it is but the shell and husk of the Divine Message. The eternal truths conveyed in the spiritual teaching of the chapter are infinitely more precious than any possible items of agreement with the present aspects of so changeful and progressive a study as that of the physical laws which interpret the Creator's Will.

Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Israel.[1]

By the Rev. Canon T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Oxford.

Part I.

Times have changed since the only use that could be made of a Zoroastrian Scripture was to hang it up by an iron chain among the foreign curiosities of the Bodleian Library. Had I the pen of Dean Swift I might amuse the reader by some sarcastic sentences on the indifference of old Oxford to the treasure which it possessed. This, however, would be unfair, as a moment's consideration will show. We need not disparage the achievements of the chivalrous Anquetil-Duperron, whose claims on the respect of the present rulers of India seem hardly inferior to those of another great Frenchman, the gifted, but unfortunate, Dupleix. But we must not forget that it was an Oxford professor, Hyde, who first urged the importance of searching for the sacred books of Zoroastrianism, and a Scotchman named Fraser who made the first unsuccessful attempt to obtain instruction from the Parsees in the contents of those Scriptures. And if it was the enterprising young Frenchman who published the first version, necessarily altogether inadequate, of the Avesta, our own University has from the year 1880 onwards been publishing accurate, though doubtless improvable, translations of the Zend and Pahlavi records of the Zoroastrian religion. The door of the treasure-house has now been fully opened, and opened by Oxford herself. A French, an English, and an American scholar have divided the work of translation; but the plan is an Oxford plan, and the publication is through the Oxford press.

To Dr. Mills in particular our thanks are due for reminding us, both by the spoken and the written word, of the importance of the Avesta to critical students of the Bible. Nor must we forget his two eminent predecessors. It was Archdeacon Hardwick who first called attention to this subject in his *Christ and other Masters*, a good early specimen of the Cambridge school of theology. Professor Max Müller renewed this appeal in his well-known *Introduction to the Science of Religion*, and it is no slight sign of progress that those ancient Zoroastrian hymns, called collectively the Gâthâs, of the interpretation of which this careful teacher eighteen years ago spoke so doubtfully, is now sufficiently well understood to be used for historical purposes. Such uncertainty as there is relates only to the details of translation, not to the general purport of most of the hymns. I make this statement, not only on the authority of the Oxford editor of the Gâthic hymns, but of eminent younger German Zend scholars, such as Geldner and Hübschmann. But let the reader examine the different versions himself, having first gained some general knowledge of the subject, and judge. And after reading the Gâthâs, let him pass on to the "later Avesta," and in due time to the texts which in their present form are the latest of all, translated by Dr. West from the Pahlavi. My readers are probably not themselves Pahlavi or Zend scholars; neither am I. Neither is Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye, whose sketch of the religion of Ahura Mazda, in a work which is now being translated, is the best which we at present possess.[2] It is not Zend studies which we aspire to promote, but the better comprehension of Jewish antiquity by the help of the results of Zend scholarship. There is doubtless much work to be done both in the criticism of the Zoroastrian and in that of the biblical and the allied literature before the last word can be said on the subject of these lectures. But we have at any rate, even in Zend studies, got sufficiently beyond the pioneering stage to begin the historical inquiries to which I invite you.

[1] This article forms the chief part of a public lecture delivered in the University of Oxford in March 1891. Like its sequel, it supports the historical and exegetical views advocated in the author's *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co.).

[2] See his *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*. Band I., 1888; Band II., 1889.

In which direction, then, shall we bend our steps? Shall it be to that battle-ground of historical critics —the early chapters of Genesis, or the less dangerous, though perhaps less interesting, field of Jewish angelology? In both these departments satisfactory results may be obtained, and in the latter sufficiently positive ones to serve in part as the basis of a historical construction. The subject of angelology, however, does not attract me to-day. Partly because it has been treated with great thoroughness by a distinguished Rabbi, Dr. Alexander Kohut, and I should not like to incur the imputation of captiousness by criticising some of his results in a public lecture. Partly, too, because the subject does not appear to me to have pressing importance. It is not the religion of the Bible but that of the Korán which makes the doctrine of angels a fundamental one, and though "He shall give His angels charge over thee" may be no mere form of words to a modern Christian, yet such a one may feel but a languid interest in the details of Jewish angelology. The later Avesta ventured on a dangerous path when it consecrated for worshippers of Mazda an elaborate and even superstitious doctrine of spirits, and I would not occupy your precious minutes with tracing its injurious influence upon Israel's religion. No; it is a harder because a less familiar subject by which at present I feel myself attracted, viz. the growth among the Jews of a spiritual doctrine of the future life, which may, as I hope, be elucidated by the help of Zoroastrianism. Such a doctrine appears full-blown in the Christian and in some of the later Jewish teaching, but it is evident that it must have passed through more than one earlier stage. It is these earlier stages of which I am in search in the present lectures.

Let no one presume to say that inquiries of this kind are irreverent. To quote from a learned Israelite, "It is anything but the right sort of reverence, when we would rather have unknown or misunderstood a region of literature which we all love and venerate, and to which we owe most of our moral and religious ideals, than trace its elements and analyse their psychological and literary history, so as to understand the object of our love."[1] It would not be irreverent to maintain that even such important conceptions as the resurrection and the spiritual vision of God were altogether borrowed by the Jews, the one from Iranian religion, the other from a Hellenistic religious philosophy, but it would certainly be fraught with serious consequences for Christian theology. Let us boldly face these consequences if we must, but, so far as I can see, the critical study of ancient religions by no means enforces a complete revolution in the received Christian view of revelation. To me the religion of Israel appears not a thing of shreds and patches, but a tree which has grown in proportion to the wants of the Church-nation. Those two sublime conceptions of which I spoke were not borrowed from without, in the manner of an eclectic and syncretistic philosophy. Both Babylon and Persia may, under God, have helped forward their growth, but they existed potentially among the Israelites in germs which had, to a certain extent, an inherent power of development. The hypothesis of borrowed beliefs is an easy but not always a very critical one, and it appears to me in cases like the present to be inconsistent with the policy of Israel's church-leaders, who felt that the originality of their own religion would be endangered by too large an admixture of elements of foreign origin. They may, I admit, have given way on matters of secondary importance (such as the number, character, and work of the denizens of the spirit-world), and I grant further that in the long-run even these concessions may have proved injurious, but on matters of vital concern they stood firm, and refused foreign innovations. And if even in these they allowed themselves to be influenced from without, it was only because, reflecting on their moral experience and on the bearings of their fundamental beliefs, they felt a natural attraction towards those who had outrun them on the same line of thought. The influence exerted upon them was not that of a master upon a slave, but that of one disciple of the true God upon another. Israel, though the destined leader of religious progress, was comparatively slow in his development; was there any reason why he should not receive, not indeed entirely fresh intuitions, but stimulus to thought, and, it may be, sometimes even forms of theological expression, from without?

I most willingly admit that this determination of Israel's church-leaders not to follow foreign teachers into wholly unfamiliar paths, nor to adopt

[1] Goldziher, *Hebrew Mythology*.

anything which they had not already begun consciously to feel after, and which was not the natural complement of their own inherited beliefs, makes it peculiarly difficult to prove that discipleship which I have ascribed to them. It was for this reason that I selected, as the title of this lecture, "*possible* Zoroastrian influence upon Israel's religion;" I wished, that is, rather to claim too little than too much, for you will imagine that I think my own results to be something more than possible though less than certain. Three things only are certain, and these I make my starting-points:—(1) That from 536 B.C. onwards, the Jews were in constant intercourse with the Persians; (2) that Persian influence upon the Eastern, and finally upon the Western world was, for good or for evil, both wide and lasting; and (3) that there is a strong natural affinity between the higher Jewish and the higher Persian religion. At the two former points I can but glance. Of course, the Jews who lived nearest to the centre of the Persian monarchy would be more exposed than others to Persian influences; but when once Persian ideas were in circulation, they could not but penetrate gradually to the furthest limits of the empire. If even in the Christian period we still find the less noble Persian beliefs powerfully affecting the Jews, how much more at an earlier time must kindred spirits have owned the attraction of a comparatively pure Mazdeism! I could say much to explain and qualify these statements, but time forbids. It is the third point, viz. the strong affinity between the religion of Ahura Mazda and that of Jehovah, to which I must now restrict myself, urging you once more to derive your ideas of it, not merely from compilations, however excellent, but from the Zoroastrian records themselves. Even through the veil of an English, French, or German version the thoughts reveal themselves in a fascinating though sometimes enigmatical originality. Commentators and compilers may give priceless help, but the basis of your knowledge must be supplied by the Zoroastrian writings.[1]

How close and even tender a relation could exist between a faithful Mazdayasnian and his Lord can only be adequately realised from the Gâthâs, those five books of metrical chants which criticism permits us to regard as an authentic record of the great prophet and reformer, Zarathustra. They are, in fact, a repertory of these spiritual elements in Mazdeism by which this religion must have powerfully attracted the nobler Israelites. I do not, of course, assert that any of the Jews actually read the Gâthic hymns, but only that the truths enunciated or implied there would be those which by a spiritual tact they would instinctively welcome. The inconsistencies which grieve the sympathetic and yet critical student of Mazdeism, they would feel to be excrescences in the same sense and degree as the analogous inconsistencies in their own popular religion. They would not be hindered by these motes in the sunshine from using with reference to the Persians those words of the prophet Malachi, "The name of Jehovah is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered unto His name and a pure offering."[2] I should like nothing better than to draw out at length the remarkable affinities between the religions of Jehovah and Mazda, to which even Professor Chantepie de la Saussaye has not, in my opinion, done full justice. My time, however, forbids me to do so. I must confine myself to those two profound conceptions of the kingdom of God and of the rewards of righteousness in which Zoroastrianism may fairly be held to have anticipated the best Jewish religion. The two conceptions are allied; the first naturally leads on to the second. The true great king is Ahura Mazda; he is, as his name imports, the wise or omniscient Lord; but omnipotent he cannot be, so long as evil hinders the establishment of the Righteous Order (Asha) in the creation. It is the great object alike of Zarathustra and of his followers to co-operate with Ahura Mazda in the setting up of the Righteous Order and the defeat of the Lie-demon and his servants, and the beauty of the prophet's teaching on the rewards of righteousness is that it makes them begin in this life, but gives the supremacy to those rewards which are (to use Western language) spiritual. The school of Zarathustra had, in fact, reached a distinction, which to the Jews came much later, between the material or bodily life and the spiritual or (to adopt Dr. Mills' word) mental, the latter of which brings us into connection with "those

[1] On Zarathustra, his age and character, also on the Avesta, and our right to use it for historical purposes, *see* my *Bampton Lectures* (1891), pp. 433–437.

[2] Mal. i. 11.

veritably real (eternal) worlds where dwells Ahura."[1] The distinction is no imaginary one, based upon one or two doubtful passages. Here is another passage :—

"And now in these thy dispensations, O Ahura Mazda! do thou act wisely for us, and with abundance with thy bounty and thy tenderness as touching us; and grant that reward which thou hast appointed to our souls, O Ahura Mazda! Of this do thou thyself bestow upon us for this world and the spiritual; and now as part thereof (do thou grant) that we may attain to fellowship with thee and thy righteousness for all duration."[2] In short, heaven and hell are not primarily localities, but states; the one is called "life" or "best mental state," the other is "life's absence" or "the worst life"—a truly noble doctrine, as much above the multitude, no doubt, in Zarathustra's day as in mediæval and modern Christendom.

But can a faith like Zoroastrianism, which is not merely for the philosophic few but for the multitude, have nothing to say on recompenses of good and evil deeds after death? Surely not. Zarathustra himself indeed had no elaborate theory of "the last things." He was content with the assurance of the triumph of Ahura over Angra-Mainyu (Ahriman) which no temporary success of the evil one could render doubtful. It was his privilege to open the "gates of heaven" to the poor as well as to the rich, on condition of their "fighting the good fight" against all that was contrary to Ahura's holy will. "Immortality" meant to this great teacher and his followers not merely the prolongation of being (*Ameretât* = "deathlessness"), but the perfection of another blessing which was associated with it, viz. happiness of body and soul, begun in this life and raised to its highest degree in the next (*Haurvatât* = "welfare"). "To his kingdom," says Zarathustra, "belong *Haurvatât* and *Ameretât*."[3] From the very beginning of the world, evil was ordained for the evil and "happy blessings" for the good, to be adjudged "in the creation's final change."[4] The "final consummation and bliss" (to quote from the English Prayer-Book) takes place at that general judgment which is to follow the decisive defeat of Angra-Mainyu (Ahriman). It is then that, evil having been cast out, the earth shall be renewed, and the bodies of both good and bad shall be raised. The righteous shall be set apart for heaven (*garô-dmâna* = "the song-house"), the wicked shall be cast back to hell (*drujo-demânem*, "the abode of the Lie-demon"). But this is not the only judgment according to Zoroastrianism. Even in the Gâthâs (the oldest part of the Avesta), we twice find a reference to the so-called Judge's Bridge (the bridge, spoken of in various mythologies, which joins the two worlds), to pass which is the privilege of the good, but to fall from the it the doom of the bad; and this terrible and decisive test of character is applied before the final judgment. In other words, there is a first or private judgment, in which the judge is a man's own conscience (personified as a beauteous maiden in a fine allegory, *Vend.* xix.), and a second or public one, the agent in which is Saoshyant, the great hero-prophet and his "helpers." And, if we ask, of what sort were the risen bodies of the saints? A remarkable passage of the Avesta throws some light upon this. It contains a prayer that not only the soul of the believer but his glorified body might "go openly" to "the best world of the saints," and that there he might "come round about God, and attain to entire companionship with Him."[5] Yet even before the resurrection there seems to have been, in a true sense, the "vision of God" according to a famous passage in the "later Avesta." For the righteous soul passes from the "Judge's Bridge" by four steps, the last of which brings him to the "Endless Lights," where is the "house of songs" (*see* above).[6]

And now let me ask, Can Israel have been uninfluenced by this profound doctrine which came to it from a religion so congenial in some respects to its own? Surely not. Angelology and dualism cannot have been the only Persian doctrines which attracted the Jews. In my second article I hope

[1] *Yasna*, xliii. 3. I quote Dr. Mills' translation. M. de Harlez, with his usual preference for elegant, modern expressions, renders "ces mondes parfaits qu'habite Ahura."

[2] *Ib.* xl. 1. De Harlez renders the close of the above passage thus, "Donne-la telle qu'elle nous compète pour ce monde et pour le monde céleste; que nous l'obtenions telle (que je l'indique); que nous nous attachions à toi et à la sainteté, pour tous les siècles."

[3] *Ib.* xlv. 10. De Harlez, "À son royaume appartiennent l'intégrité et l'immortalité."

[4] *Yasna*, xliii. 5. De Harlez, "J'ai vu que, rétribuant les actions et les paroles, tu donnes le mal au méchant et la bénédiction sainte au bon, par ta vertu, au dernier terme de la création."

[5] *Yast*, xxii. 15.

[6] *Ib.* xxii. 33.

to justify the assumption that the resurrection was another.[1] To-day my contention is that, at any rate outside the Egyptian-Jewish literature, not only allusions to resurrection, but expressions which suggest the hope of the higher immortality, should be accounted for in the first instance by Persian influence. Nor is religious literature the only department to be examined. The historical notices of Jewish society must be carefully searched for indications of possible Zoroastrian tendencies. Our course is no doubt beset with difficulties. Not only are these notices very incomplete, but our chief authority, Josephus, has incurred the grave suspicion of having tampered with facts to please his Græco-Roman patrons. But we must not, like the slothful man in Proverbs (xxii. 13), be frightened by a report of lions. Josephus' Græcising account of the three Jewish schools speaks veraciously to those who can pierce through to the underlying ideas. Let us devote a few minutes to his sketch of the Essenes, it will help us when we come to the Book of Enoch, which has been thought to contain passages more or less distinctly Essenian. I will quote a part of the principal passage in English: "For the opinion is prevalent among them that bodies are corruptible, and that the matter they are made of is not permanent, but that souls are immortal and continue for ever, and that they come out of the most thin air, and are united to bodies as to prisons, into which they are drawn by a certain natural enticement; and when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh, they then rejoice and mount upwards, as if released from a long bondage. They think also, like the sons of the Greeks, that good souls have their habitation beyond the ocean . . . . . while they allot to bad souls a murky and cold den, full of never-ceasing punishments. And indeed the Greeks seem to me to have the same notion, when they allot the islands of the blest to their brave men, whom they call heroes and demi-gods; but to the souls of the wicked the region of the ungodly in Hades," etc.[2]

Now it is impossible to speak on these passages without taking up a position with regard to the radical criticism of Ohle, who, accepting Zeller's view of the essentially neo-Pythagorean character of the Essenes of Josephus and of the supposed Philo, undertakes to show that the accounts of Essenes in the former are spurious. Nothing, in fact, is left of Essenism by this critic but a very simple form of religion which may be naturally viewed as a development of Pharisaism. I cannot bring myself at present to accept this radical criticism. There is much in Josephus' account of the Essenes, which altogether tallies with our previous expectations, and can be explained either from native Jewish or from Zoroastrian beliefs. Yes; from Zoroastrian beliefs. On this point I agree fully with Bishop Lightfoot, though I cannot help doubting whether all that he ascribes to Zoroastrianism is genuinely Essenian. For instance, was there ever such a thing as "Essene worship of the sun"? I admit that the Greek of Josephus[3] (*War*, ii. 8, 9) refers to the sun-god; indeed, my own sense of the mythological character of the phraseology is even stronger than Bishop Lightfoot's. But I cannot make Josephus responsible for every detail of Greek phraseology in the translation of the treatise on the Roman war. I cannot believe that any recognised Jewish sect offered worship to the sun, without there being an indignant reference to this in the Gospels and the Talmud. But I do not deny that the Essenes adopted with special zest the custom of saying the first prayer at daybreak, which was, almost demonstrably, suggested by Zoroastrianism, and it is possible that Josephus' literary assistant turned this innocent practice, which may have been accompanied by an uplifting of the hands, into an act of worship to the sun, such as is still common in India. The biographer of the Emperor Akbar (Col. Malleson) tells us how his hero "has been called a Zoroastrian, because he recognised in the sun the sign of the presence of the Almighty,"[4] and we all know how in Tertullian's time a familiar Christian custom received an equally gross misinterpretation.

I do not, of course, seek to relieve Josephus altogether from the charge of misinterpretation. It is certain that he passes very lightly over one of the most essential doctrines of Pharisaism, that which relates to the resurrection and the judgment. Is it not probable that he deals similarly with the Essenes? The belief in the immediate reception

[1] That this is not wholly superfluous is shown by a recent very able article in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* (October 1890), by M. Montet, of Geneva.

[2] Jos., *War*, ii. 8, 11 (Shilleto's revision of Whiston).

[3] ὡς μὴ τὰς αὐγὰς ὑβρίζοιεν τοῦ θεοῦ. [4] *Akbar*, p. 163.

of the recompense of a soul after death is by no means inconsistent with the belief in a great final judgment, when (as the Zoroastrians at any rate held) the happiness or misery of the soul would be greatly intensified, and the fact that John the Essene was one of the Jewish generals in the war with Titus proves that the Essenes in his time, at least, shared the popular belief in a final judgment. And if this be so, may we not presume that the Essenes also held the belief in a glorified body? This certainly agrees as well as possible with the theory of pre-existent souls entering at last into bodies which is ascribed to this sect. What I mean is this. The Essenian doctrine of the soul in Josephus, divested of its false Greek dress, combines two elements—a Babylonian and a Persian, both, of course, adapted to Hebrew modes of thought. The happy islands remind us rather of Babylonia than of Persia. But the Essenes described by Josephus, being fully abreast with the later religion of Israel, could not restrict this Paradise to "have men called heroes and demigods" (say, to Abraham, Enoch, Elijah, as friends of God); they, of course, considered it to be open to all the faithful. Nor could they, at that advanced period, have failed to identify it with that "better world of the just" (a phrase of the Avesta), which our Lord describes as the "Kingdom of Heaven." On the other hand, the description of Hades is distinctively Zoroastrian, *i.e.* Persian, and not less so is the alternative account which Josephus gives of the Essenian view of the future of righteous souls. In fact, the opening words of the famous passage of Josephus (*War*, ii. 8, 11) give a reflection of the Zoroastrian view of those ideal and yet real existences called the fravashis, those "guardian angels" which were so linked to human nature as to be practically indistinguishable from souls. Without implying the theory expressed in a late Zoroastrian book (the Mînôkhired), that the constellations are for the most part "guardian spirits," one might venture to say, applying Josephus' words, that the fravashis "keep coming (to earth) from the most subtle ether," to which when this life is over they will return. There is no doubt one discrepancy between the Zoroastrian theory and the Essenian, but a satisfactory explanation of this can, I think, be given. In fact, it is only by reading Josephus' account of the Essenes in a Zoroastrian light that it becomes in all respects clear.

You may tell me that this is at most a probable result. Perhaps it is; but no one who is interested in the history of Judaism and Christianity will despise it on that account. Josephus, it is true, is a writer of the first Christian century; but the spiritual forces which acted upon the Jews of his time must have been long since in operation. Zoroastrian influences, at any rate, if they can be admitted in the time of Josephus, can still more readily be understood in the earlier period. We have a right, therefore, to compare the views of any part of the Book of Enoch with those which we have found reason to assign to the Essenes, and to ascribe in some measure to Zoroastrian influences. That the religious views of the different parts of Enoch are not by any means the same, is well known. The picture of the divine judgment and of its consequences given in the Similitudes, is much more distinctly spiritualistic and, if I may say so, Essenian than that in the *Grundschrift* (or earlier part of the book). It must not, however, be overlooked that even the *Grundschrift* presents points of contact with Essenian views. It would be a mistake to say that its view of the state of the righteous dead is lower than that in the Similitudes. It is true that in C. 5 it speaks of them as possibly sleeping a long sleep; but the phrase "the sleep of death" has different shades of meaning with different writers, and it can be shown that this sleep, even in the oldest part of Enoch, was not supposed to exclude great, though imperfect, joy or pain. In the temporary abode of the righteous (which is not in the underworld, but, as also with the Essenes, far away in the west of the earth) we are told that there is a fountain of water and light (xxii. 9). Now, what can this mean but that the departed righteous soul has even before the judgment a foretaste of the vision of God which later writers delight to express by such images? It is also true that in V. 9, a long life is all that is promised; but it can, I think, be shown that a spiritual and eternal state of being is only postponed, not denied. The Zoroastrian conception of a glorified spiritual body seems common to both the main divisions of the Book of Enoch.

But I must not linger on this interesting and

important book. I must not, for instance, refer to the account of Jehovah's fiery palace, in chap. xiv., nor to its developed angelology, nor to its doctrine of the renovation of the world, which, though not without Jewish germs, has been largely influenced by Zoroastrianism. Suffice it to say that, had I space to discuss this, the result would confirm the view that both the universally admitted leading divisions of Enoch are tinged with Zoroastrianism. But I venture with some hesitation to go further. The title of this paper speaks only of the religion of Israel. But to me, as a Christian scholar, the New Testament is the crown of the religion of Israel, and upon the whole, as even Havet admits, it preserves the character of a Hebraic work. Let me say out, then, in conclusion, that the Pauline and Johannine forms of thought appear to me to contain some strikingly Zoroastrian elements. I have no antecedent prejudice against the view that Hellenic ideas and sentiments have filtered to some, as yet uncertain, extent into the New Testament; but I think with Harnack,[1] that specifically Hellenic ideas are not the presuppositions either of the Fourth Gospel or of the other important New Testament writings. I think, too, that so far as an infiltration of Hellenism took place, it was only possible because more or less similar Oriental influences had gone before. Zoroastrian ideas had been in the air long before the battle of Issus, and had too tenacious a life to be destroyed. Alexander, like the mad Antiochus after him, might burn the Scriptures of a hostile religion; he forgot that it is ideas which give permanence to books, and not books to ideas. Had I space I could refer to many New Testament passages which, perhaps, betray the direct or indirect influence of Zoroastrianism. I must confine myself, however, to one of the most famous, viz. 2 Cor. v. 1–10. In spite of what Pfleiderer has so ably urged.[2] I am not convinced that the Apostle is altogether Hellenising. Even if he borrowed a Greek expression directly from the Book of Wisdom and indirectly from Plato, he did not borrow his idea. The strictest Palestinian Jew might have called the body a "vessel" or a "tabernacle," and the notion of the future state which this passage contains reminds us not so much of Wisdom as of the Book of Enoch, the writers of which are, as we have seen, unconsciously affected by Zoroastrian influences. May I not go further and suggest that the invasion of Egyptian Judaism by Greek philosophical ideas is more easily accounted for, if the Jews who entered Egypt under the early Ptolemies had been already in some degree Zoroastrianised; in fact, that the Alexandrine-Jewish philosophy is a synthesis of Judæo-Zoroastrian and Greek elements, different enough upon the whole, and yet not without striking points of contact? To take but one example. How attractive the Platonic upper world of ideas and spirits would be to those who had already an analogous though less philosophical belief of Judæo-Zoroastrian origin! It may be urged indeed, on the other hand, that both by Philo and by the author of Wisdom the Judæo-Zoroastrian idea of the resurrection is ignored. That is true; but it is undoubtedly referred to in the Septuagint.[3] Philo may perfectly well have rejected some Zoroastrian ideas, and accepted others which were supported by Greek philosophy. Even Freudenthal, the author of *Hellenistische Studien*, admits the possibility of a connection between Alexandrinism and Zoroastrianism;[4] and Siegfried, in his classical work on Philo, produces modestly enough some evidence of its reality.[5] But I must not now develop this theory; it would lead me into a department of research which I have reserved for another lecture. Let me only add that no one is more conscious than I am of the difficulty of absolutely proving any particular example of Zoroastrian influence, owing to the strength of the Jewish capacity of assimilation. The linguistic proof of the original connection of Asmodeus (the demon who takes the place of Satan in the Book of Tobit) and the Aeshma-deva is indeed too clear to be denied; but almost everything else can be doubted. The general truth of Zoroastrian influence upon Judaism cannot, however, be questioned, and historical theologians will not be displeased with an attempt to show how this influence may have worked. I do not pledge myself not to enter on the fields which I set aside at the opening of this paper; but in these two lectures I must limit myself to the chosen subject of the doctrine or doctrines of a future state. If I can help some students to the right historical point of view, I indicate some possible results which give body and substance to a truth which without these would be lifeless, my chief objects will be gained.

[1] *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 68. [2] *Urchristenthum*, p. 299.

[3] *See* Sept. Isa. xxvi. 19; Job. xix. 26; Ps. i. 5, xliii. 14, lxv. (title).

[4] Review of Siegfried's *Philo*, in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, 1875, p. 234.

[5] *Philo von Alexandria*, p. 141.

The Septuagint.

PROFESSOR GRAETZ'S THEORY.

By the Rev. Professor H. B. Swete, D.D., Cambridge.

In the April issue of The Expository Times, notice was taken of a remarkable article which appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* of October 1890. This article, signed by Professor Graetz, proposes to fix the date of the Greek Pentateuch (LXX.) as late as the fifth decade of the second century B.C. The importance of the question thus opened seems to justify some examination of the arguments on which Dr. Graetz bases his theory.

His contention is briefly as follows. The translation was made under the auspices of an Alexandrian king. But since it accentuates the antagonism of the Pharisees and Sadducees, which arose out of the Maccabean wars, the work cannot have been executed before the days of Jonathan (161–143), and belongs to the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (d. 146), well known as a supporter of the Jews, and patron of the Onias who founded the temple at Leontopolis. Each of these conclusions hinges upon a verbal criticism.

1. The use of ἄρχων and ἀρχή to represent מֶלֶךְ and מַמְלָכָה in Deut. xvii. 14–19 disposes Professor Graetz to accept the statement of 'Aristeas' so far as to admit that the version was made at Alexandria, under the auspices of a Ptolemy. Such a sentence as (15) ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου καταστήσεις ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν βασιλέα might have had a suspicious sound in the ears of a foreign king, and the wary translator wrote ἄρχοντα. Thrice in this context ἄρχων stands for βασιλεύς; and ἀρχή is twice used for βασιλεία.

But the force of this argument is at least much weakened by a glance at other contexts. Ἄρχων is used to translate מֶלֶךְ in Gen. xlix. 20 (Ἀσὴρ . . . αὐτὸς δώσει τρυφὴν ἄρχουσιν), where it is difficult to believe that the word was preferred out of any tenderness for royal scruples. On the other hand, βασιλεύς holds its own in Gen. xxxv. 11 (βασιλεῖς ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος σου ἐξελεύσονται). The fact seems to be that the less definite term was occasionally used as a mere synonym for the more exact; comp. Sirach xlvi. 13–16 (προφήτης Κυρίου κατέστησεν βασιλέα [v. l. βασιλείαν], καὶ ἔχρισεν ἄρχοντας ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. The ἄρχοντες are here Saul and David, and the ἀρχή is a βασιλεία.

2. Professor Graetz sees a Pharisaic colouring in Lev. xxiii. 11–16, which indicates a date as late as, if not later than, the middle of the second century. The Pharisees were at variance with the Sadducees as to the interpretation of the phrase מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, which occurs in vers. 11, 15. Now, in ver. 11 the present text of the LXX. distinctly favours the view of the Pharisees, rendering τῇ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης, *sc.* τῶν ἀζύμων (comp. ver. 7 and Matt. xxvi. 17). But are we at liberty to infer that τῆς πρώτης is here the original rendering? Dr. Graetz answers in the affirmative. "When in ver. 17 the same phrase is rendered ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαύριον τῶν σαββάτων, this must be an interpolation in the LXX. by ἄλλος. The original translator could not have been guilty of such gross inconsistency or thoughtlessness as this variation would imply." It seems to me more likely that τῆς πρώτης in ver. 11 is the gloss, and τῶν σαββάτων the original rendering in both places. Nothing is more common than to find a corrector altering something which is opposed to his own views at its first occurrence, and forgetting to alter it when it occurs again; the converse is certainly less natural. Moreover, τῆς πρώτης in ver. 11 is not in undisputed possession. Dr. Graetz observes that Origen had noticed a variant τοῦ σαββάτου or μετὰ τὸ σάββατον, and this reading reflects itself in a little group of existing cursives (Cod. 85 $^{mg.}$; comp. Codd. 29, 83, and Ald.). On the other hand, one or two authorities show a disposition to make ver. 15 correspond with the present text of vers. 11 (Codd. 85 $^{mg.}$, 130*); and it is possible that a similar tendency has been at work in ver. 16, for τῆς ἐσχάτης can scarcely be an original rendering of הַשְּׁבִיעִת, and looks like an attempt to set up a contrast to τῆς πρώτης.[1]

Thus it seems open to a defender of the earlier date of the Greek Pentateuch to invert Dr. Graetz's reasoning, and to argue that τῆς πρώτης in ver. 11 is a Pharisaic gloss of the time of Philometor, which implies the existence of the version in pre-Maccabean times. I refrain from entering upon the questions of external evidence to which his article incidentally refers, and content myself with venturing to express the conviction that the two criticisms on which he principally relies are inadequate to bear the burden of so serious a responsibility.

[1] The reading of ἑβδόμης for ἑβδομάδος by Cod. Alexandrinus and the second and third "hands" of Cod. Vaticanus (B* has ἑβδομαδης), as well as several cursives, suggests an original τῆς ἑβδόμης ἑβδομάδος, with τῆς ἰσχάτης as a variant. There seems to be no trace of the O. L.; but the Vulg. attempts, I think, to combine both readings: "ad alteram diem expletionis hebdomadæ septimæ."

Some Ancient Versions of the Scriptures.

By Rev. Professor Archibald R. S. Kennedy, M.A., Aberdeen.

Among the daily increasing number of laymen who follow with interest the progress of biblical research are not a few who are apt to get confused among the technicalities of modern criticism. It is for such among the readers of The Expository Times that these notes are intended. Their aim is simply to state, in as brief a space as possible, what is known of the origin of the more important versions of the Scriptures, with some indication of their value for the critical student.

(*a*) The Septuagint.

First in age and importance comes the translation of the Old Testament in Greek known as the Septuagint version, or version of the Seventy (LXX.), so called from the tradition that it was the work of seventy or seventy-two elders, who had been sent by the Jewish Sanhedrin to Alexandria for the purpose at the request of Ptolemy Philadelphus (see Expository Times for April). It is now admitted that this tradition is entirely devoid of foundation. The following may be considered as a fairly accurate summary of the conclusions of modern scholars regarding the origin of the LXX.: —(1) The LXX. owes its existence to the desire of the Greek-speaking Jews in Egypt to possess the Old Testament in what was now their mother-tongue. (2) The translation was made by men of varying ability at different times, extending over a century or more, beginning with the five books of Moses about the middle of the third century B.C. (3) The greater part, if not the whole, of the translation was executed at Alexandria.

The extreme importance of the LXX. for the textual criticism of the Old Testament is due to the fact that very few of the MSS. of the original text of the Old Testament are older than the twelfth century of our era, the oldest dated MS. being of the tenth. In the LXX., therefore, we have a witness to the text of the Old Testament *twelve hundred years older than any Hebrew MS.* Unfortunately the text of the LXX. has suffered in the course of transmission infinitely more than has the text of the original Hebrew, but it nevertheless remains *facile princeps* among the critical apparatus of the Old Testament student.

The most convenient edition for the ordinary student is that just completed under the editorship of Dr. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek, according to the Septuagint* (2 vols., Cambridge University Press, 1887 and 1891). The introduction to vol. i. gives a succinct account of the principal MSS. of the LXX. and of the primary editions.

(*b*) The Targums.

By the Targums (from a Semitic root signifying "to interpret," whence also "dragoman") are meant the versions of parts of the Old Testament in Aramaic, the Semitic dialect which, at some period before the birth of Christ, supplanted Hebrew as the vernacular of the Jews. One of the officials of the synagogue was the Meturgeman (interpreter), whose duty it was to render the lessons for the day into the language "understanded of the people." These official renderings or Targums were at a late period committed to writing. Many such Targums have irretrievably perished; of those that still survive the most important are the two following:—(1) The Targum of Onqelos, of uncertain authorship and date. It is a literal rendering of the Pentateuch, and probably assumed its present shape in Babylon in the third or fourth century of our era. The best edition is that of Dr. Berliner, with notes, in two vols. (Berlin, 1884). There is an English translation of this and other Targums of the Pentateuch by J. W. Etheridge. (2) The Targum of Jonathan, containing the prophetical books, is named from a pupil of the celebrated Hillel. Parts of this Targum, as of Targum Onqelos, may be as old as the first century, but it can scarcely have received its final redaction before the fourth or fifth.

The Targums are of more value for the exegesis than for the textual criticism of the Old Testament, as their authors had before them a text practically identical with that of our Hebrew Bibles.

(*c*) The Peshitto.

The Greek and Aramaic versions of the Old Testament are, as we have seen, the work of Jews. The Syrian Church was the first to possess a translation of the completed canon made from the originals by Christian hands. This was the Peshitto (*i.e.* simple or literal) version in Syriac, which dates from the second century, or, at latest, from the beginning of the third.

The Peshitto is of importance for the history of the canon, but especially for the textual criticism of the New Testament, having been made from manuscripts but little removed in time from the autographs themselves. For a complete list of the editions, in whole or in part, of the Peshitto see my translation of Nestle's *Syriac Grammar*, second edition, 1888.

(*d*) The Vulgate.

Strange as it may seem, the official language of the Roman Church, for the first century at least

of its existence, was not Latin but Greek. The need of a Latin translation of the Scriptures was first felt in North Africa. The history of the Latin version (or versions) before Jerome is still very obscure. This learned father first undertook to revise the version in common use, the so-called Old Latin. After his removal to Bethlehem, however, he set himself to the task of issuing an entirely new translation, which appeared at intervals between 393 and 405 A.D. This version, to which the name Vulgate (*editio vulgata*) was given, gradually drove the Old Latin from the field.

An interesting illustration of how history repeats itself is afforded by the Latin Psalter. The latter is not, like the rest of the Vulgate, the version made by Jerome from the original Hebrew, but the Old Latin version made from the LXX. By centuries of liturgical use, this version had become so familiar to the Latin Church that it was found impossible to displace it by the more accurate version of Jerome. Now, the English Psalter in King James' version had a precisely similar experience, and to this day the English Prayer-Book version of the Psalms remains that of the Great Bible of the century preceding.

Jerome's date, his scholarship, and his familiarity with Jews and Jewish traditions, all unite to render the Vulgate one of the most important of the ancient versions.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

THE following Examination Papers are set in accordance with the conditions laid down in recent numbers. Answers must be received by the EDITOR, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B., on or before the 20th of June.

I.

BY THE REV. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.

1. What do you understand by the creation of man, his formation out of the dust of the earth, and his being made in God's image?

2. What do you understand by the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and by the tree of life?

3. Why was Abel's offering accepted and Cain's rejected?

4. What arts are ascribed to the posterity of Cain; and why would you expect to find the arts flourishing among his posterity?

II.

BY THE REV. PROF. J. T. MARSHALL, M.A.

1. Summarise the arguments of Delitzsch in favour of the Mosaic *origin* of the several parts of the Pentateuch.

2. What are the fundamental conceptions in the Biblical account of creation? Compare this with the Babylonian tradition.

3. Explain the words תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ, i. 2; רָקִיעַ, i. 6; בְּצַלְמֵנוּ, i. 26; תּוֹלְדוֹת, ii. 4; אַרְבָּעָה רָאשִׁים, ii. 10; תְּשׁוּקָתֵנוּ עָקֵב, iii. 15; כְּרוּבִים, iii. 24; שָׁאֵת, iv. 7.

4. Translate Gen. iv. 20–26, and parse each verb in this extract.

III.

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL H. C. G. MOULE, M.A.

The Epistle to the Ephesians.

1. Briefly but carefully examine—
   (*a*) The occasion and date of the Epistle.
   (*b*) Its precise destination.

2. *Putting this Epistle for the time aside*, what does the New Testament tell us, directly or indirectly, about Ephesus and the Ephesians?

3. *From this Epistle alone* construct a simple statement of—
   (*a*) The Person and Work of Christ.
   (*b*) The work of the Holy Spirit in the Christian.
   (*c*) The Church, and its relation to Christ.

4. Write notes, as for an annotated Bible, on any three of the following passages (reckoning each *letter* (*a*, *b*, and *c*), as one passage):—
   (*a*) Chap. ii. 8.
   (*b*) „ iii. 19.
   (*c*) „ iv. 8.
   (*d*) Chap. iv. 11, 12.
   (*e*) „ vi. 12, 15.

IV.

BY THE REV. PROF. J. AGAR BEET, D.D.

1. Reproduce and discuss Meyer's exposition of Ephesians ii. 1, "Dead through your trespasses and sins;" or of verse 3, "And were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest."

2. Expound, in its relation to the foregoing, Eph. iii. 19, "That ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God."

3. Reproduce and discuss Meyer's exposition of Eph. iv. 8, "And gave gifts unto men."

4. Expound, in its relation to the context, Eph. v. 23, "Himself the saviour of the body."

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xv. 58.

"Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord" (R.V.).

Exposition.

"*Wherefore.*" "So then, consequently"—that is, since the victory over death is thus secured.—*Ellicott.* Because there is a life hereafter, let this life here be worthy of it. Christianity never separates, in precept or in promise, "the life that now is," and "that which is to come."—*Shore.*

The Apostle began the discussion by declaring that if there is no resurrection of the dead, his preaching and their faith are equally vain. He closes his argument with an appeal to their Christian conscience, and their conviction that, because there will be a resurrection, their humble toil from day to day in the work of the Lord will be no more in vain than their faith in Christ, no more in vain than Christ's death and atonement.—*Edwards.*

"*My beloved brethren.*" Under the influence of the hopes and triumphs now recounted, the Apostle's soul melts into tenderness.—*Edwards.*

"*Be stedfast.*" Rather "*become* stedfast;" they are not so yet, either in faith or conduct. They must become rooted in Christ to be confirmed.—*Godet.*

"*Stedfast and unmoveable.*" The meaning of the two words is substantially the same. If, speaking of a building, we call it stedfast, the idea suggested is, that it is a work of strong masonry, standing firm on a solid foundation. To say it is immoveable is to say that it is proof against wild storms and violent assaults. It is unmoveable because it is stedfast.—*R. S. Candlish.*

"*Stedfast and unmoveable, always abounding.*" The meaning may be, either, that if we are stedfast and immoveable in faith we will always abound in the work of the Lord; or, that to abound in the work of the Lord is the great means of maintaining stedfastness in the faith.—*R. S. Candlish.*

It is an exhortation to stedfast *confidence* on the one side, and on the other to inflexible *loyalty*.—*Oosterzee.*

"*Abounding.*" The verb strictly means "to flow over the edges all round."—*Godet.*

"*The work of the Lord.*" His is the work in which His people labour. And they labour therein, each according to his different calling, by the active fulfilment of His will as *servants of the Lord.*—*Meyer.*

The words may refer to the homely duty which forms the substance of next chapter.—*Stanley.*

By this the Apostle understands labour for the spread of salvation, and for the development of the spiritual life. The word "*always*" is added to remind them of the indefatigable perseverance which should characterise such work.—*Godet.*

Methods of Treatment.

I.

By the Rev. J. A. Broadus, D.D.

Here are two exhortations. First, to be firm in religious conviction; and then, to be active in religious duties and work. Are there any here who once were full of faith, and into whose hearts doubts have come? Notice the connexion here. It is only as you work, are busy in doing good, that you will be stedfast. Go to work!

And then he adds this encouragement. "Ye know that your labour is not in vain." You serve a risen living Redeemer. Jesus is a cause sure to succeed, and in the end you shall have your eternal reward.

II.

"Be Stedfast."

By the Rev. Archibald G. Brown.

The chapter of which this text is the climax has come to be looked upon as a requiem to be intoned over the dead, rather than as a trumpet note to be sounded in the ears of the living. But, although well-suited for the ears of mourners, it is yet better suited for a company of Christian workers. Paul had no intention of simply bringing forward the doctrine of the Resurrection. His object, when he wrote, was to confirm the Corinthians in their stedfastness in relation to the gospel already preached to them. So that all that is said in this chapter is intended to give force to the injunction of the last verse.

1. First, we have an argument drawn from the past: "Therefore." What is it that has gone before which affords an argument to stedfastness? (1) There is *the resurrection of Christ.* "There-

fore—because Christ is risen—therefore, be ye stedfast." The resurrection of Jesus was the great subject of early preaching. It was this that roused the anger of the Jews. Now, the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ stamps the Christian religion as genuine,—therefore, let us be stedfast. And "mighty to save" is the testimony of the resurrection. (2) We have *a present, living, and reigning Christ.* You find this in the 25th verse. "For He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet." He *must* reign. Who says it? The eternal Father who passed His word that He should "see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied." Every Old Testament prophecy declares He must reign or we shall be falsified. Every attribute of deity thunders out, "He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet,"—therefore, be stedfast in His work. (3) The third argument from the past is *our immortality.* There is something beyond the grave that will compensate for all earth's sorrows. Abound in the work, for in a short time the Master will call His reapers home. (4) Another argument is *the return of Christ, and the change of those who are living in that day.* This is the 51st verse. This doctrine is seldom dwelt upon, and so many churches are left high and dry. Believe when you wake in the morning that before the evening falls you may see the folding doors of heaven flung open, and the great High Priest coming out of the Holy Place with the music of the bells upon the hem of His garment, and you will not be unstable or indolent in His work. (5) *The grand ultimate triumph of Christ* is an argument that says, "Be stedfast." You have this in the 54th verse. We hear a voice saying, "Hold the fort, for I am coming." Our triumph is certain. The Church of God will never capitulate till heaven bows to hell.

2. Some duties enjoined for the present. (1) To be *stedfast.* What in? Why, the gospel. Read the first verse. Is not this verse just a continuation of that? A gospel of three facts,—Christ's dying for our sins, Christ buried, Christ risen. If a man is right on these three points, he will hardly be wrong on any; if wrong, he can hardly be right on any. And then, be ye stedfast *in obedience and duty.* A living Christ suggests this thought. You yield obedience to one captain only. Be ye stedfast to Him then, like the Roman sentinel found grasping his weapon at his post amid the ruins of Pompeii. (2) "*Always abounding in the work of the Lord.*" His work, whether in making home happy, or, if you can, in outside mission enterprise. How long? "Always." Not spasmodically earnest, but driving right on through all weathers.

3. There is this sweet encouragement gleaned from the future. "Forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord." It will not be vain as far as *your own person* is concerned. He who works most for his master is the healthiest. And it will not be in vain as far as *others* are concerned. If you are only driving the plough or scattering the seed, and others are to do the reaping, yet the Master has noticed your work. To you, too, He will say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father."

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Wherefore.

SELDOM, even in Scripture, has a single word been laden with so heavy a burden as this "wherefore." It carries the whole weight of St. Paul's sublime and elaborate argument.—*Samuel Cox.*

THE whole of the preceding argument furnishes motives for zeal and devotion in the service of the Lord. For if Christ died for our sins according to the will of God (and the resurrection proves this), if, therefore, His sacrifice was accepted in heaven, sin has no more dominion over us, no more claim upon us. We no longer drag with us on the steep and difficult path of duty a chain which lengthens and grows heavier at every remove. And He is not dead, but liveth. He lives to take pleasure in what we do. Because Christ is gone up into heaven we "seek the things which are above." And that *we* shall have part in the resurrection adds many incentives. It is worth our while to labour and deny ourselves that we may prepare ourselves for a life so endurable and sublime. The very illustrations which the Apostle uses strengthen the motives to service. When winter changes into the spring, when the grain sown in the earth rises through corruption into a waving wealth of corn, the message comes home to us, "Thou, too, shalt change and die. Thou, too, if faithful to thy call and ministry shalt arise and shine as the stars for ever."—*Samuel Cox.*

ST. PAUL'S aim throughout this chapter is not to enlarge our knowledge of the future, not to comfort mourners, not to take away the fear of death; all these aims are gained, but they are not the primary ends before him. He sets this matter of resurrection from the dead right in the minds of the Corinthians, because false views of it were injuring the *service* they were to render.—*T. T. Munger.*

IT is very striking and very expressive of the real spirit of the gospel that a chapter which leads us step by step through the calm process of logic, and through glowing passages of resistless eloquence to the sublimest thoughts of immortality, should at last thus close with words of plain and practical duty.—*Shore.*

A PHILOSOPHER handling with consummate ease the largest speculations of his time, a historian with an almost unrivalled faculty for discerning in the issues of past ages the principles which govern present events, a prophet whose visions of future glory left him at times high above the limitations of time and sense, St. Paul is, above all things, a moralist bent on teaching men the purer laws which came with Christ, and winning them to a more constant obedience. —*Samuel Cox.*

Stedfast, Unmoveable.

HE means as regards our belief of the resurrection. And the reasons for stedfastness in the belief of the resurrection are these: (1) It touches the credibility of the Apostles (ver. 15). (2) The reality of the great work of propitiation is at stake. (3) Our justification and peace depend upon it.

(4) It has an important bearing on holiness of character, and diligence in service.—*R. S. Candlish.*

THE differentia of the Christian, that which distinguishes Christian faith from every other form of opinion or belief, is the one conviction that Jesus is at this moment conscious and supreme. The question which separates men into the two great classes of Christians and sceptics is this: Did Christ rise from the dead? If He did, then there is a spiritual power stronger than the mightiest physical forces in nature; a spiritual power which can compel natural laws to subserve spiritual purposes. By His resurrection we are put in possession of God and immortality. But if, on the contrary, He still lies in His grave in "the lone Syrian town," if death terminated His living touch with this world, and if now He is helplessly separated from it, then the relation of the Apostles and martyrs is no more, and for aught that Christianity can say to the contrary, Nature is God, and beyond the limits He imposes, we have no outlook at all.—*Marcus Dods.*

MANY persons are found holding right opinions, and using good prayers, yet improving very little, if not going back, in real spiritual wisdom. They ask, perhaps, every morning that they may always do what is righteous in God's sight; and every evening that their hearts may be set to obey His commandments; but, it may be, all the while they have *no serious intention* of the kind. When temptation comes they fall away, almost, of course.—*Keble.*

Always abounding in the Work of the Lord.

"THIS is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent." That first; then it consists in doing the will of God. And this is the will of God, "that of all that the Father hath given Him, He shall lose nothing." We are fellow-workers with Christ. In this work we are to abound—overflow—always. Our abounding is not to be fitful and capricious, but steady, uniform, and constant.—*R. S. Candlish.*

FAITH in a resurrection produces a consciousness of boundless and endless power for work. In the case of a believer, youth's large dreams never contract into commonplace achievement. The thought of finality in life and work gives place to the hope of an eternal enlargement of sphere, ever-increasing powers, ever more effective service.—*Edwards.*

WHAT is "work in the Lord?" All honest, faithful work is, in a sense, work in the Lord; for it is work done in accordance with the Divine laws, and work that really serves the world which the Lord loves. Hearken to holy George Herbert:—

"Teach me, my God and King,
In all things Thee to see;
And what I do in anything,
To do it as for Thee.

"All may of Thee partake;
Nothing can be so mean,
Which with this tincture—*for Thy sake*—
Will not grow bright and clean.

"A servant with this clause
Makes drudgery divine;
Who sweeps a room as for Thy laws,
Makes that and the action fine.

"This is the famous stone
Which turneth all to gold;
For that which God doth touch and own
Cannot for less be told."

Samuel Cox.

IT is only "in the Lord" that labour is "not in vain." Our labour may be abundant even in a good work, the work of beneficence or of religion, and yet not in the Lord. It may be a work of self-righteousness, a work of penance, a work of party or church, a work of our own. The question will be, Did ye do it unto me?—*R. S. Candlish.*

WE are raised up at the last day that we may resume our labour in the Lord.—*R. S. Candlish.*

Presbyterian Forms of Service.

Presbyterian Forms of Service. Issued by the Devotional Service Association in connection with the United Presbyterian Church. Edinburgh, 1891.

THE issue of a Service-Book on Scottish soil, and within an ecclesiastical body so truly indigenous as the United Presbyterian Church, calls up visions of Jenny Geddes and her more emphatic than elegant form of protest against liturgical innovations. The appearance of this volume, however, is no indication of a desire to change our Presbyterian form of worship, still less to substitute a Liturgy for free prayer. An impression has been growing for several years that sufficient attention has not been paid to the devotional part of public worship, nor to the conduct of special services such as the administration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, ordinations, marriages, funerals. Accordingly in this volume, "illustrations" are given "of the manner in which the various services may be appropriately conducted under the existing system of public worship in the United Presbyterian Church."

We are bound to say, after a detailed examination, that these services are well drawn up on distinctively Presbyterian lines, and that a study of them cannot fail to be suggestive to a preacher. Worshipping once in an Episcopal chapel on the Continent, we were conscious of a certain accusing thought. We felt that we did not touch the life of our people at so many points, nor gather up all their wants and aspirations as that noble Liturgy did. But the next Sabbath our eyes were opened to the bondage and limitation of stereotyped words repeated again and again. The aim of this book is to educate by example to breadth and manifoldness of sympathy, without any enslavement to

particular forms. The baptismal, marriage, and funeral services will be of great service to younger ministers. We have been particularly struck by the excellence of some statements on baptism. The selection of passages suitable for the burial of the dead is exceptionally full. On the whole, without innovating upon established order, this book will help in securing greater seemliness, variety, and freshness in Presbyterian devotional services. JOHN SMITH.

The Religious Literature of the Month.

BOOKS.

LONG looked for, Professor Kirkpatrick's edition of **The Psalms** in the **Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges** will be heartily welcomed (Cambridge: The University Press, fcap. 8vo, pp. lxxix, 227, 3s. 6d.). This volume embraces the first Book of the Psalter (Psalms 1-41), but it is not to be supposed that there will be volumes for each of the remaining four Books, since nearly a third of this volume is occupied with the Introduction.

MESSRS. T. & T. CLARK have this month issued a book whose modest title is not likely in itself to attract such attention as it deserves, and the pleasure with which we have gone through it compels us to offer a hearty word of recommendation — **How to read Isaiah**, by Buchanan Blake, B.D., Clydebank, crown 8vo, pp. 187, 3s. 6d.). How to read Isaiah is how to understand Isaiah; it is marvellous that the prophecies should become so intelligible when in their proper setting and free from all needless accessories. "Partly from accidental circumstances and partly from their nature," says a great commentator, "the prophetic writings have not received from the ordinary Bible reader that share of attention which they deserve." This book shows us that the nature has less to do with it and the accidental circumstances more than we had dreamed.

WE hope to publish shortly a survey of recent literature on Inspiration and Biblical Criticism. We shall, therefore, do no more at present than mention three volumes which will come within that survey. Two of them are by the Rev. John Urquhart, the editor of *The King's Own*, **What are we to Believe?** (John F. Shaw & Co., crown 8vo, pp. 231; paper, 1s. 6d., cloth, 2s. 6d.), and **Jehovistic and Elohistic Theories** (4to, pp. 67, 1s. nett). The third deals with a much larger subject, **Revelation and its Record**, and is in every respect an important book, conservative and scholarly. It is by the Rev. A. B. Cameron, M.A., B.D., Edinburgh (Andrew Elliott, crown 8vo, pp. 295).

Words to Christian Workers, by F. E. Marsh (Drummond's Tract Depôt, Stirling, crown 8vo, pp. 297, 2s. 6d.), is written by one Christian worker, and should be in the hands of all others.

Zacchæus, by G. Stringer Rowe (Simpkin, crown 8vo, pp. 70). What is this? It is not a sermon, nor a series of sermons. It is not "an ideal" biography. It is a Biblical monograph after the German method, though very far removed from any symptom of German Rationalism in the handling. Those who know Mr. Rowe's *Alone with the Word* will seek this little book. It is of the same character, but fuller, more personal, more interesting. There is room for more such monographs.

MR. ANDREW BROWN, Wanlockhead, has published the essay on **The Sabbath**, which gained one of the prizes in a recent important award (Edinburgh: Andrew Elliott, crown 8vo, pp. 187). Its title is "The Christian Minister's Duty with reference to the Sabbath."

From America has come some of our very best literature on Palestine. There is Thomson's *Land and the Book*, which has remained the text-book on the subject for a period surprisingly long in so progressive a science as Eastern Archæology. Then there is Dr. Selah Merrill's *East of the Jordan*, which is not known, however, or appreciated as it ought to be. And now there is **Edward Wilson's "In Scripture Lands"** (The Religious Tract Society, 4to, pp. xvi, 384, 15s.), a notable volume in several respects. Its great feature is the magnificence of its illustrations, some of which we admired when they appeared in the *Century* as amongst the finest specimens in that finely-illustrated magazine. But the letterpress is also both accurate and readable. And then the paper and the binding are just as good as there is any use for. Yes, a notable volume in every respect, and an ideal gift in summer or in winter.

Under the title of **The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit**, Mr. R. D. Dickinson has published a small volume (crown 8vo, 188 pages), which consists of a series of addresses delivered at a Conference in the city of Baltimore, U.S. The subject seems to have been carefully distributed amongst the speakers, for here most of the leading points in the Scripture revelation of the Spirit's Person and Work are dealt with, and the speakers know and appreciate their several topics. The most important contribution is made by Bishop Nicholson, whose special subject is "The Spirit of Prophecy."

MESSRS. GRIFFITH, FARRAN, OKEDEN, & WELSH have issued a very ingenious aid to the carrying out of the precept, "Let all things be done decently and in order." It is called a **Sermon Register and Ready Reference.** First you have ruled paper, and columns with appropriate headings, where you can record the text of each sermon you have preached, the place, the date, and remarks. This part will hold 1000 texts. The second part is then a ready reference to this register. The books of the Bible, in their order, have a page or two each, where the number of the sermon in Part I. is entered. A glance at this index shows where the sermon may be found, with its place, date, and remarks. The author is the Rev. E. H. Rand, M.A. It is published at 2s.

Dr. Alexander B. Grosart has issued, through Mr. Elliot Stock, an enlarged edition of his **Songs of the Day and Night** (small 4to, pp. xxii, 285; paper, 3s. 6d.; cloth, 4s. 6d.), with the words "for private circulation only" omitted, as we are glad to see. The book will be sought by many different people from many different impulses. Some for devotional, some will welcome it for expository uses; some will seek pleasure in its melodious enshrinement of their own remembered experiences; some heart and hope for battles yet to come; some will be ready to add another volume to their library of hymnology; some will lay eager hands on a daintily-printed, old-fashioned, soon to be "scarce and rare," small quarto; and many, we hope, will find the book a treasure, as we do, for all these reasons combined.

From the *Church Bells* Office there is just issued an **Album of Notable London Churches** (crown 4to, 1s.). The illustrations are unassuming, but very good, and the short description is straightforward and accurate. A list of the incumbents is given in every case, sometimes from the twelfth century.

Mr. George Stoneman sends **The Systematic Bible Teacher** (crown 8vo, 224 pp., 2s.), compiled by John Greene, founder of the Systematic Bible Teaching Mission. The speciality of the system is that it never changes. The lessons are divided into three grades (of which this volume gives I. and II., with illustrative notes, questions, hymns, catechisms, and full scheme for examination); and when parents and teachers once know them well, they can teach them always. The system has a greater advantage (over the International Lessons, for example) for the great body of teachers than may be supposed, though of course it has its limitations.

Mr. Stoneman has just issued a little book (32mo, 116 pp., 1s.), by W. T. Lynn, B.A., F.R.A.S., Lay Reader in the Diocese of Rochester, which contains short biographies of thirteen great men of the Bible, from Abraham to Luke. It is beautifully bound, and should prove an acceptable and useful gift. The title is **Eminent Scripture Characters.**

Guy Wynmore's Repentance (crown 8vo, 116 pp., 1s. 6d.) is another of Mr. Stoneman's new publications, and is both wholesome and attractive.

Some booklets deserve attention—*Hid Treasure; or, The unrecognised Quotations of the New Testament from the Septuagint Version of the Old*, by Richard Harris Hill (Cassell, 1s.); *The Promises to the Seven Churches*, by the Rev. Robert A. Mitchell, M.A. (Aberdeen: D. Wyllie & Son, 2d.); *The Prince of Peace: Songs in Praise of Jesus Christ*, by William Macintosh, M.A. (Kelso: J. & J. H. Rutherfurd); *Wonderful Grace: Sonship Now; Likeness Then*, by Charles Bullock, B.D. (*Home Words* Office, 1d.); *Made, Marred, and Made Anew*, by Pastor Frank H. White (Partridge, 1d.); *The Increase: A Year's Record of Facts and Results in the work of the Stirling Tract Enterprise*, 1890 (Stirling); *The Building of Solomon's Temple*, by the Rev. David Jamison, B.A., Newton Hamilton (Dublin: Humphrey & Armour).

NOTABLE SERMONS AND EXPOSITIONS IN MAY.

Exod. vii. 20 (Talmage), Christian Herald, 17.
Num. xix. 15 (Spurgeon), Sword and Trowel.
xxvi. 63–65, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2198.
Josh. i. 8 (Dening), Churchman's Magazine.
Job xi. 8 (Parker), Christian Commonwealth, 498.
xxxvii. 21 (Henrey), Church of England Pulpit, 800.
Ps. xvii. 1 (Parker) Christian Commonwealth, 499.
xviii. 1 (Gregory), Wesleyan Methodist S.S. Magazine
xxiv. (Cooke), Baptist Magazine.
xxxviii. 17 (Martin), Christian Million, 394.
cxxii. (Stalker), Christian Leader, 487.
cxxx. 7, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2199.
Prov. xxix. 18, Original Secession Magazine.
Song v. 2 (Odom) News, 809, 810.
Isa. xlv. 2, Primitive Methodist Magazine.
xlviii. 18 (Macmillan), Sunday at Home.
lxiii. 1 (Pennington), Quiver.
Ezek. xxxvi. 27, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2200.
Matt. viii. 13 (Spurgeon), Christian Herald, 17.
x. 28 (Clarke), Theological Monthly.
xvi. 25 (Byles), Sunday Magazine.
Mark vi. 16, Holland Road Pulpit, 119.
viii. 21 (Thorold), Good Words.
Luke vii. 12 (Collisson), Quiver.
viii. 18 (Brewin), Preacher's Magazine.
xii. 4, 5 (Clarke), Theological Monthly.
xiii. 11 (Carrington), New and Old.
xix. 41 (Rainsford), Churchman's Magazine.
John i. 40–42, Primitive Methodist Magazine.
vi. 15 (Dale), Freeman, 1891.
vii. 14–18 (Baker), American Churchman, 2414.
viii. 12 (Henrey), Church of England Pulpit, 799.
x. 10 (Newbolt), Family Churchman, 500.
x. 11 (Meyer), Christian, 1109.
xiv. 6, 9 (Stevinson), Methodist Recorder, 1741.
Acts i. 3 (Pearse), Preacher's Magazine.
viii. 36 (Thorold), Good Words.
ix. 11, Worker's Monthly.
xix. 2 (Senior), Fireside.
xix. 2 (Thorold), Good Words.
Rom. ii. 29 (Pereira), Theological Monthly.
vi. 4, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2197.
xvi. 25–27 (Moulton), Methodist Recorder, 1741.
1 Cor. iii. 10 (Rogers), Evangelical Magazine.
xv. 51, 52 (Hall), American Churchman, 2412.
2 Cor. iv. 5 (Marsh), Footsteps of Truth.
iv. 6 (Henrey), Church of England Pulpit, 801.
v. 1 (Macmillan), Quiver.
Gal. ii. 20 (Bullock), Day of Days.
iii. 3 (Caird), Modern Church, 5.
iv. 10 (Jones), Sunday at Home.
Eph. vi. 17, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2201.
Phil. iii. 10 (Ellicott), Church of England Pulpit, 801.
2 Tim. i. 6 (Byles), Sunday Magazine.
i. 10 (Rowlands), Chicago Standard.
i. 12, British Messenger.
ii. 1 (Savory), British Weekly, 234.
Heb. xii. 24 (Maclaren), Freeman, 1891.
James ii. 12 (Murphy), Presbyterian Churchman.
Jude 3 (Mees), Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.
Rev. iii. 1–6 (Urquhart), King's Own.
v. 1 (Jones), Literary Churchman, 8.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

With the issue of the number for October, which commences the third volume, The Expository Times will be enlarged. A powerful programme is in preparation, of which some account will probably be given next month. Meantime it may be useful to indicate in a few sentences with what aim we go forward to the work of the enlarged series. Our purpose is twofold: to record the results of the best study of the Bible in the present day in an interesting and practically useful form; and to stimulate and guide both clergy and laity towards a fuller, more accurate, more fruitful study of the same inexhaustibly precious library. Our ideal has been above our performance, but we shall still keep that high ideal in view, even should we every month experience the disappointment of falling far short of it.

It is the study of the Bible in the present day with which we have to do. It is impossible, therefore, to avoid contact with questions that are hot to the touch. We shall not shun such contact when our path lies through them; but we desire to have it understood that our first concern is with the results rather than with the theoretical processes of Bible study. If from either side of any sharply divided camp there come fresh light upon the Word of God, if either side offers the fruit of reverent study of that Word, ever bearing in mind that the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is there, we shall gladly welcome it.

Sometimes it may be necessary, in the very carrying out of these aims, to seem for a time to be departing from them. Thus we announced a few months ago that some articles would be written for The Expository Times by Professor Sayce on "The Higher Criticism tested by the Monuments." Immediately we received a number of communications urging us to let our readers, first of all, have some conception of what the present position of the Higher Criticism was, that they might be able to follow and appreciate Professor Sayce's articles. This reasonable request it has been our special endeavour within the last few months to comply with, distinguished scholars having done us the honour to contribute papers which have dealt with the great standing problems of Old Testament criticism. In a short time we hope to commence the publication of Professor Sayce's promised articles.

We are obliged to Professor Swete for directing our attention to a slip in last month's issue. The Cambridge Septuagint is not yet finished, he says, with a sigh. The arrangement followed is that of the Vatican MS. (Codex B), in which Tobit is succeeded by Hosea. The third volume will thus contain the Prophets, the Books of the Maccabees, etc., and complete the work.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review for April contains a very readable paper by Principal Cairns on "Recent Dogmatic Thought in Scotland," a very learned and very stiff paper by Professor H. P. Smith on "The Use of the Vulgate in Textual Criticism," and other articles of present interest and worth. But the article to which most

readers will turn is Mr. L. B. Paton's account of Professor Klostermann's investigations into the origin of the Pentateuch. These investigations, the results of which Professor Klostermann has published in two recent issues of the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, are of more than ordinary importance. We shall endeavour to present their leading points here, but those who wish fuller knowledge, and are debarred from using the original articles themselves, cannot do better than turn to Mr. Paton's long and able survey.

Dr. August Klostermann has been at Kiel as ordinary professor since 1868. His published works are many, and marked by scholarship and independence. In textual criticism he is a foremost authority; so that when he comes forward, as he does in these articles, with arguments which directly assail the very foundation of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, he can neither be passed by as unworthy of attention, nor charged with undue bias towards traditionalism.

Professor Klostermann finds the materials of his assault in that department of study to which he has given special attention—the criticism of the text, or Lower Criticism, as it is called. The higher critics believe that Genesis is a composite of many different writings. They can trace the different hands that have been employed upon it, even to the division of a sentence. The most frequently quoted, because most intelligible, evidence of composite authorship is the use of different names for God. There are thus, we are told, two distinct narratives of the Flood, the work of two distinct authors. One uses the name Elohim, and is called the Elohist; the other the name Jehovah, and is called the Jehovist. Place these narratives in parallel columns, as one sometimes sees them placed, and the evidence of their distinct duality seems irresistible.

But there are difficulties. The Elohist and the Jehovist cannot always be separated so; they rarely come clean away. Moreover, they certainly do not divide the Pentateuch between them. If there are two, there are several hands at work there. And, worse than all, not one of these authors preserves his individuality for any length of time. In the midst of E., J. suddenly appears; and again E., or some one else, interferes while J. is busy writing. Even when the number of original authors is multiplied, they cannot be kept separate. And so here comes in what is undoubtedly the weakness of the Higher Criticism. We must postulate Editors, or Redactors as they are called—not one but many must be postulated—until the matter offers itself a ready object of merriment, with its mathematical formulæ to represent the many authors and the still more numerous redactors.

Professor Klostermann does not deny the phenomena. One must be stone-blind to deny them. A child can see that the story of the Flood, to return to the former instance, seems to be twice told. He does not deny the phenomena; but he believes that they can be accounted for in a much simpler way than by the permutations and combinations of the Higher Criticism. His theory is that there existed two different MSS. of Genesis, and when the present text was formed use was made sometimes of one and sometimes of the other and sometimes the same narrative was quoted from both and set down side by side. That is to say, the narrative of the Flood was originally committed to writing by one hand. This was the primitive text. As this text got copied, errors would creep in; its language would even be altered to suit other times; still more, corrections and explanations would be inserted; and thus one MS. might, in process of time and through distance of space, differ very greatly from another. When two or more such MSS. were consulted, for the purpose of preparing an authoritative text, much freedom was shown in the choice of readings, and sometimes no choice at all was made, but both accepted.

This theory Professor Klostermann supports by abundant illustration and exceedingly skilful reasoning. He believes that, in the Book of Psalms, we see this very process carried out. In the formation of that great rounded portion of the Psalter, Ps. ii. to lxxxv. (Ps. i. is introductory), two different collections were used. These collections, or their MSS., belonged to different periods, since the one uses the name Elohim, the other Jehovah. In combining these two, the

editors went on the principle of choosing each Psalm from the collection which was oldest, or seemed to them the best. But in one instance (compare Psalms xiv. and liii.), they take the same psalm from both collections, allowing it thus to appear in the final text twice, Ps. xiv. showing a preference for the name Jehovah (translated "the LORD" in our versions), and Ps. liii. for the name Elohim ("God").

Precisely similar, according to Dr. Klostermann, has been the formation of our present Genesis. "A Jehovist recension and an Elohist recension lay before the compilers, and they have taken extracts from both. Usually the Divine names remain unchanged, but in the section, Gen. ii. 4–iii. 24, which would naturally always be read in connection with i. 1–ii. 3, the name Elohim was later inserted, not because Jehovah Elohim ('the LORD God') was a current form of speech, but simply to indicate to the reader that he might preserve consistency by substituting Elohim for Jehovah. Neither the Divine names nor the names of the patriarchs are in any sense a characteristic of the original text; and when the special Genesis criticism of the day makes Jehovah and Elohim, or Jacob and Israel, the infallible test by which it can draw the line between the vitally connected members of a sentence, I must say that such criticism seems to me, in spite of its apparent activity, to have all the signs of scientific death."

In a still more recent issue of the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, the magazine in which Professor Klostermann's articles appeared, there is an article of a remarkable character by Professor Hausleiter of Erlangen. Its title is, "The Faith of Jesus Christ, and the Christian Faith;" and its object is to prove that in certain places of his writings, but especially in Romans iii. 25, 26, St. Paul speaks not of the faith of the believer, but of the faith of our Lord Himself. Thus, the meaning of the celebrated words, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood" (ver. 25), he would take to mean, "through Christ's own faith in His blood." And again, the words of verse 26, "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus"—literally, "justifying him who is of faith of Jesus" (δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ)—would signify, "justifying him who shares the faith of Jesus."

The reasons which Professor Hausleiter gives for his remarkable renderings are briefly these: (1) The name "Jesus" is never elsewhere regarded by the Apostle as the object of the believer's faith; and (2) Jesus Christ could become a propitiator only by reason of His perfect obedience ("through faith"), without which the act of redemption would have been an entirely passive act.

But yet more startling is Professor Hausleiter's explanation of St. Paul's celebrated quotation from Habakkuk: "The just shall live by faith" (ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται)—Rom. i. 17. "The just," he says, "does not mean just persons in general, but Christ Himself, the just *par excellence*." He it is who, by means of His perfect obedience, manifested in His redeeming death, has obtained the resurrection from the dead, just as He, by the same obedience, put an end to the dominion of the Law, and brought in the reign of faith. In this way, he would show that the prophetic text cited by the Apostle has an essentially Messianic signification.

This article by Professor Hausleiter is noticed in the first number of a new and exceedingly welcome French magazine, the *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie;* and there, in three sentences, Professor Bois of Montauban states what seems to us the one insurmountable obstacle to the acceptance of Hausleiter's interpretations. They contradict, he says, the very theme of the Epistle to the Romans. That theme is incontestably *Christian* faith regarded as the subjective condition of justification or of *salvation.* "It is this condition that the Apostle recalls whenever he speaks of the redemption, and it is therefore upon it that he insists in these celebrated passages also in the first and third chapters of the Romans."

The April issue of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* opens with an account of the Jews in France at the present time, by Rabbin S. Debré. This is followed by what looks at first sight the driest of all dry articles on "Jewish Ethical Wills," by the Editor, but which turns out to be most pleasantly

written and full of interest. The ethical will, that is to say, a will which disposes, not of money and estates but of good sound practical advice for the conduct of life, was a well-established usage among the Hebrews, from very early times. As examples of ethical wills in the Bible, Mr. Abrahams mentions the blessing of Jacob, the dying request of Joseph to his brethren, the address of Moses to the people of Israel, the advice of David to his son Solomon, the restriction laid by Jonadab the son of Rechab upon his children against the use of wine, and his exhortation to dwell in tents, and the injunction of the prophet of Bethel on his sons: "When I am dead, then bury me in the sepulchre wherein the man of God is buried; lay my bones beside his bones" (1 Kings xiii. 31).

"In several of these passages," says Mr. Abrahams, "the verb used is some form of צוה, 'to command,' and in later times there has been a tendency to interpret the verb in a restricted sense, so that צוה comes to mean to 'give a צוואה' that is, to leave an ethical will. When Isaiah prophesies the death of Hezekiah, he bids him צו לְבֵיתֶךָ ('set thine house in order,' 2 Kings xx. 1), and the meaning may be 'Give your household directions for their conduct after your death.' There can be little doubt that this is the signification of Deut. xxxii. 46, where Moses says, 'Set your heart upon all the words which I testify unto you this day, *which ye shall command your children.*' Even more striking in this connection is a passage in Genesis xviii. 19, where God says of Abraham, 'For I have known him, in order that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord.' The latter text, in particular, has been made the basis of an actual rubric, to be found in modern Jewish codes, enjoining on every father, as a bounden duty, to leave moral exhortations for his children's guidance."

Of the way in which Jewish fathers fulfilled in later days this bounden duty, Mr. Abrahams gives some very beautiful and some very curious examples, while he admits the general sameness and conventionality of the ethical will. "I never kissed my children," says Alexander Suesskind, "nor took them in my arms, so as not to accustom them to silly talk, such as people are in the habit of addressing to the young." Naphtali Cohen, Rabbi of Posen, who died in 1719 leaves this in his last will and testament, addressed to his wife:—"My Beloved Esther, once from our great love we clasped hands and mutually promised that, when either of us two died, the other would pray to die soon afterwards, that we might quit the world together. But this wish was not right, and you have my pardon if you live a hundred years. I altogether undo our compact. If you die first, which God forbid, you must do the same. I ask you not to marry again, though I know I need not say it; but I add the words out of my overwhelming love for you." Moses ben Nachman's testament, which is in the form of a letter to his son, belongs to the end of the thirteenth century: "Humility," he says "is the first of virtues; for if you think how lowly is man, how great is God, you will fear Him and avoid sinfulness. Look not boldly at one whom you address. Regard everyone as greater than thyself." David Altaras leaves orders that no rhymes should be engraven upon his tombstone, and tells why he ate no meat in Lent. And there are more curious ethical wills than these.

But one of the finest examples of the ethical will, before tradition drove the freshness of nature out of it, may be found in the Apocrypha. The fourth chapter of the Book of Tobit Mr. Abrahams describes as in itself a complete and beautiful ethical will. "Tobit's directions to his son, who is about to leave him in search of fortune and a wife, have inspired, unless I am greatly mistaken, the writers of many a later testament. Thus, besides being intrinsically one of the noblest in Jewish literature, the fourth chapter of Tobit is in truth the earliest specimen of the Jewish ethical testament, if by that term be understood the elaborate form which post-Talmudic authors have so successfully cultivated."

This Book of Tobit, about which Bishop Westcott wrote with enthusiasm many years ago and wondered greatly at the neglect in which it lay in England, is one of the books which, as Mr. Thomson puts it, "influenced our Lord and His Apostles." The title (*Books which Influenced our Lord and His Apostles: being a Critical Review of*

Apocalyptic Jewish Literature, by John E. H. Thomson, B.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 8vo, 1891, 10s. 6d.), is startling and not altogether free from reproach. But the book is a fair, honest introduction to a subject which is as much neglected to-day in England as it was when Bishop Westcott wondered at it. Mr. Thomson does not review the whole Apocrypha, he centres himself upon the Apocalyptic in it. But he goes through that important department so as to give one who follows him a good working knowledge of its character and influence. May his work be the harbinger of better days for the Apocalypses of the Old Covenant; in them we may yet find the "key" which will unlock the wholesome treasures of instruction that lie in the Apocalypse of the New.

1 Corinthians vii. 14.

A REPLY TO A REQUEST.

By the Rev. D. W. Simon, M.A., D.D., Principal and Professor of Theology, Congregational Theological Hall, Edinburgh.

What does Paul mean by the words ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ ἁγιά ἐστιν? *Else verily your children are unclean; as it is, however, they are holy* [clean]? Before trying to interpret them let me quote the context, from ver. 12 to ver. 17. *If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she is content to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And* [if there is] *a woman which hath a husband that believeth not, and he is content to dwell with her, let her not put him away. For the husband that believeth not is sanctified in* [with and through] *the wife; and the wife that believeth not is sanctified in* [with and through] *the husband: else verily your children are unclean; as it is, however, they are holy. But if the one that believeth not departeth, let him* [or her] *depart. The brother or sister is under no constraint in such cases; but God hath called us to* [be at] *peace. For dost thou know, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or dost thou know, O husband, whether thou shalt save thy wife? Yet, as God hath distributed to each one, as God hath called each one, so let each one walk.*

1. As to the ὑμῶν,—the argument seems to require that it be referred to parents such as are here in question. The point is this. Your children are counted *holy*, not *unclean*, because either the father or mother is a *believer*. Why should not a husband be counted *holy*, not *unclean*, because his wife is a *believer;* or a wife because of the faith of her husband? If, however, ὑμῶν referred to parents, both of whom were believers, as many commentators suppose, the retort might fairly have been made: "The cases are not parallel,—not even as much so as otherwise: we can understand how children should be *holy*, not *unclean*, whose father and mother are both believers; but it is a different thing as between a husband and wife, one of whom is not a believer—nay more, a heathen."

2. The next question is as to the force of ἅγια and the negative ἀκάθαρτα—*holy, unclean.* The word ἡγίασται, *is sanctified*, used of the non-believing husband or wife, must clearly have essentially the same force as ἅγιον, and may be rendered *is in the position* or *stands in the relation* of a ἅγιος—one who is not *unclean*, but *holy*. If we put either a different kind or more of meaning into ἡγίασται than we put into ἅγια, or *vice versâ*, clearly the parallelism will be destroyed. It might be urged, indeed, that the relation between children and parents is so different from that between wife and husband, that a different meaning may well be put on the two words; but then the argument itself would fall to the ground, for its force lies in the assumption of some sort of affinity between the two forms of relationship.

We have then ἅγια, *holy* (and ἡγίασται = strictly, *has been sanctified, is in the position of a sanctified being or thing*), on the one side, and ἀκάθαρτα = *unclean*, on the other side. Each indicates, and to some extent determines, the force of the other. When Paul implicitly characterises children whose parents are not believers as ἀκάθαρτα, which, of course, he does, in describing the others as ἅγια, he cannot intend to attribute to them positive moral impurity, uncleanness of the kind ascribed to the δαιμόνια or πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα in the Gospels (Matt. x. 1; Mark iii. 11; Luke vi. 18, etc.). Nor can he use ἅγια in the sense of positive moral purity, uprightness, as it is used in ver. 34 of this chapter.

Do the two words then denote merely "ceremonial" purity or sanctity and the reverse? This is the view taken by some. There is no doubt that they are used in some such way, as, for example, ἀκάθαρτος in Acts xi. 8, where Peter says, *Nothing common or unclean* (ἀκάθαρτον) *hath at any time entered into my mouth;* and ἅγιος in the Epistle

*

to the Hebrews. I say, in some such way; because I am not sure that the term *ceremonial* properly expresses the point. Ἅγιος certainly has a deeper meaning than the one now commonly conveyed by the word ceremonial, even when used of the temple, sacrifices, and so forth. It signifies also *belonging to God*, and as such sharing in the sacredness—the moral or rather *personal* sacredness—which characterises God, either as the result of an act of consecration, or on some other ground.

It must not be forgotten, however, that belonging to God means one thing when affirmed of personal beings, another thing when affirmed of non-personal beings—*e.g.* temples, sacrifices, and the like. The distinction is on the same plane as the one between human property in children or relatives, and property in books or houses or lands. This is, of course, obvious; but it has a significance which we are prone to underestimate. A personal being can belong to God, in the full sense of being recognised and treated as such by Him, only after a free conscious surrender of himself to God. God cannot hold a personal being in property save as it itself constitutes Him owner.

Yet it is also and equally true that the possibility of this relationship of man to God is rooted in a prior relationship, which must also be described as a *belonging to God*—a belonging, too, which is not predicable of non-personal beings. He belongs to God by the very essence, constitution, idea of his being, even though he has also to give himself to God. In fact, he is able freely to make himself the possession of God, because of this prior relation to God. As a man he inheres in God, and that which constitutes him man proceeds from God, and separated from God perishes.

In both respects, therefore, he is ἅγιος. He is ἅγιος as to very essence, and as such, in a sense far fuller than is conveyed by the word ceremonial, a holy, sacred thing. He is ἅγιος, further, in the fuller sense of realising the idea of his essence, when he believes. Then he becomes actually what he is potentially. The actual ἁγιότης (Heb. xii. 10; also 2 Cor. i. 12 as some MSS. read) stands in a relation to the potential ἁγιότης, much the same as that between the seed and the plant, remembering, of course, man's freedom to pervert himself and his life. "Holiness" in the full sense is the actualisation of potential "holiness."

3. But in what sense can this "holiness" or "uncleanness" be said to depend on a human relationship like that between husband and wife, or parent and child? If man as man is rooted in God, and as such potentially belongs to God, that is, is ἅγιος; and, being free, has also to consecrate himself to God, and thus become actually God's property, that is, in the full ethical sense ἅγιος, how can ἁγιότης be conditioned by the faith of a husband or wife, or of parents? In the case of a husband or wife the dependence might be conceived as of the kind we ordinarily call moral, that is, the one may have to be led to believe by the other; by word and conduct the husband may be the appointed, the necessary means of leading the wife to Christ or the wife the husband. This might also be the case with older children. But besides that the word τέκνα (children) refers solely to the *relation*, not to the *age* of the related persons, and may be used of old and young alike. Suppose the τέκνα were all adults, they must have been either believers or unbelievers. If the former, the clause *else verily your children are unclean* would be worse than irrelevant; and if the latter, how could Paul say, *as it is, however, they are holy?* To speak even hypothetically of men as *unclean children* after becoming believers, because one of the parents was an unbeliever, would not be like Paul; still less to speak of unbelievers as holy because one of their parents was a believer. It seems to me, therefore, that Paul must have had young children in his mind—children too young to have been able to become believers for themselves. That consequently the dependence in question is not primarily or exclusively of the kind usually termed moral. The moral relation must not, however, be left out of consideration, as I shall try to show.

The question recurs, therefore, if men as men, consequently as τέκνα or *babes*, inhere in God; and if, owing to this relation, they are potentially ἅγια, *holy*, how can they be regarded as ἀκάθαρτα, *unclean*, if one or both of their parents happen to be non-believers, as is here implied? and what can the faith of one or both parents have to do with their being ἅγια, *holy?* In both cases, surely, the effect of the relationship to God is by implication nullified; in the one, by ascribing the holiness to *parental* faith, in the other, by denying holiness because of *parental* unbelief. Here is the crux.

The key to the problem is supplied by Paul's conception of mankind as constituting an organic whole, the nature of which he illustrates in more than one way—as, for example, by reference to the human body (see chap. xii. 12-27), or to a tree (see Rom. xi. 16-24). If humanity really be an organic whole like a body or like a tree, clearly it must be as members of the whole that individual men are rooted in God, after the manner to which reference was made above. As a member of the body of mankind, or as a branch of the great tree of humanity, each one of us is related to God—belongs to God—and is, as such, *holy;* not as separate individuals. In fact, there are no separate individuals in the vulgar sense of these words. They do not, they cannot, exist. Each of us subsists in and through the whole; the whole subsists in and through God.

Individual men, then, are related to God in and through the relation of the whole, just as the

branches of a tree are related to the soil, from which they draw their chief nourishment in and through the stem. They, as a whole, constitute the tree, but, as individuals, they are constituted by the tree.

The smaller branches in turn depend on the larger ones for the relation in which they stand to the soil; the twigs, again, on the smaller branches; till we come to the individual leaf. Its life is determined in one respect by the life of the whole tree; in another respect by the life of the twig from which it immediately springs. So is it also with the human body.

This conception is one of those which, in my judgment, dominates Paul's whole thinking, and it is often present as a co-determining factor when no distinct allusion to it is either made or is even apparent. He was what one may call an organic thinker, as distinguished from a fragmentary thinker, like, perhaps, Peter. His whole mental life, conscious and unconscious, worked, so to speak, as the living energy in a seed works, along certain lines or channels, whose course was defined beforehand by such ideas as that of organic unity.

But if this is the correct view to take of the Apostle's general presupposition, light is thrown on the particular point now under consideration. The child, as a mere child, inheres in its parent or parents much as a leaf inheres in the twig. Their life, their character, largely colours that of their child. If they belong to God, both in the potential and actual sense of being ἅγιοι, *holy*, then the child's life, too, belongs to God, is ἅγιος, *holy*—that is, in the potential sense. The limitation must, of course, not be forgotten, that no parents are as to both root and fruit, nature and character, entirely *holy*. They may be *believers*, and, as such, have consecrated themselves to God, and thus be on the road to actual ἁγιότης; but they have not attained. Nor, indeed, is such attainment, in the complete sense, possible as long as the life which circulates in them passes through from a parent stem of humanity, whose life is still to an immense extent *unclean;* the divine life in them cannot but be affected by the *uncleanness* which characterises the organism of humanity as a whole. Relatively speaking, however, the children of a believing parent are ἅγια, *holy*. Analogously, the children of non-believers, especially of such non-believers as Paul had in view—namely, heathen—are ἀκάθαρτα, *unclean*. Not absolutely so, but relatively. The divine life which flows into humanity, and without which humanity would not be what it is, flows in its measure also into them. But it is affected by the character of the branch or twig—in other words, parental source—from which it is immediately derived, and as that is unclean, not only in the potential, but also in the actual sense, the children's life has to be designated *unclean*.

So far as children are designated ἅγια, *holy*, because of the faith of their parent or parents, this view of the matter may seem to lend a sanction to the unbiblical idea of inherited holiness; but I must recall again the distinction drawn between the potential and actual, a distinction which involves another principle which also dominated the thinking of Paul, namely, that of the freedom of the individual. As soon as the members of the great organism of humanity arrive at moral maturity—that is, become capable of controlling themselves according to moral law—they either enter upon, take up, what they inherit, or repudiate it, and by faith either foster it into healthy growth so far as it is good, or suppress and kill it so far as it is evil. The leaf of a tree or the member of a natural body is acted on by the life of the whole without being able to act freely on itself. It cannot seek and secure medicine and nourishment on its own individual account. The whole tree or body must, as a whole, do whatever affects every one of the members or branches.

At this point there is a difference between humanity and the organisms with which it is compared—that is, as soon as members thereof arrive at maturity. *Every individual man can become a sort of root or rootlet through which life shall flow directly from God into the whole organism as well as into himself*, in addition to being a leaf or twig. He does not, therefore, cease to be a part of the organism; he only exercises a function which belongs essentially to him as a personal being, and which remains undeveloped as long as he is in his babyhood. Such a root or rootlet, drawing curative and nutritive energy from the great divine reservoir, every man becomes when he fulfils the condition on which the initiation of this special process depends. In the case of those who know not Christ the condition is loyal recognition of the highest known; in the case of those who know Christ it is the relation to Christ which Christ Himself designated "believing."

Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Israel.

By the Rev. Canon T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Oxford.

Part II.

Reading the other day the prospectus of a new theological review, which undertook to satisfy the claims alike of practical and of scientific theology, and to bring the ordinary reader into contact with university professors in their studies, I was startled to find the editor expressing his complete indifference to one of those subjects which some biblical professors most affect — the comparative history of religions. No doubt this old school theologian would regard my present thesis as fanciful in the extreme, and would remonstrate with me for seeking to divert the theological students of Oxford from more useful pursuits. I trust, however, that those who followed my first lecture will not be led astray by the narrow views of which this editor is the mouthpiece, and which are still too common in England. There are few more important studies for the theologian of to-day than that of the great religions, not only for the reasons which Professor Max Müller and others have again and again so ably urged, but because, until we know the facts respecting these religions and their relation to the religion or religions of the Bible, we cannot formulate a defensible doctrine of revelation, and it is surely such a doctrine the want of which is in ever-widening circles most painfully felt. Of course, too, this study has an important bearing on some of the most interesting questions of biblical criticism and exegesis. Undeterred, therefore, by the probable imputation of fancifulness (which merely means a willingness to encounter difficult problems), I resume the subject at the point which I had reached in my first lecture.

I attempted, as you will remember, to show that there is a strong affinity between the religion of Ahura Mazda and that of Jehovah (Yahveh), and that being brought into contact with the Persians, the Jews, alike in Palestine and elsewhere,[1] could not remain wholly uninfluenced by Persian religion. This presumption is verified by facts in the case of angelology and dualism; is it not likely to be also verified in the case of the Jewish doctrine of the "last things"? Resurrection and the higher immortality are two of the most striking features of the Zoroastrian faith; is it not reasonable to hold that any traces of these beliefs in the later religious books and systems of Palestine must be partly accounted for by Persian influence? It was shown in the first lecture that in certain leading expressions of Jewish belief — Essenism, the Book of Enoch, and (though this was but touched upon) the New Testament — Zoroastrian influence on their view of a future life could with much probability be indicated. To-day we must cross the border into the Old Testament, and inquire whether the later books, or parts of books, do not contain passages which express to some extent a Zoroastrian view of the "last things." The inquiry is, I know, a difficult one. Partly because, at any rate in the Psalms, the language is vague and admits different interpretations; partly, too, from the keen controversy of which the dates of many of the Hebrew books are the subject. The vagueness of the expressions does, indeed, preclude any peremptory and dogmatic assertion as to the religious belief of the writer; but I maintain that when the date of the work in which they occur is fixed on independent critical grounds in the late Persian period, we are justified in selecting out of two equally possible interpretations that which involves supposing Zoroastrian influence. You will not, I hope, misunderstand me. I maintain the essential originality of the higher Jewish religion equally with Dean Church in his fine eulogium of the Psalms.[2] I think that germs of Zoroastrianising beliefs existed in Israel before its religion was brought face to face with Mazdeism, and that, when this critical event took place, the presence within the Church-nation of a principle, called by a prophet of the late Persian age "the spirit of holiness" (Isa. lxiii. 10, 11), hindered the adoption of any manifestly dangerous Persian belief.

The inquiry which I opened in my eighth Bampton Lecture in 1889, and which I reopen to-day, is practically a new one. Twenty years ago it would have been impossible. By asking whether some of the Hebrew Scriptures do not express or imply ideas closely akin to Christian ones, I should have appeared to convict myself of critical incapacity. The reason simply is, that the criticism of the majority had erected certain conclusions of its own into dogmas, and had not faced the possibility that a large part of the Old Testament might be of post-Exilic origin. The Book of Job, for instance, was placed in the period of Isaiah, or between Isaiah and Jeremiah; of the Psalms some were Davidic, many, at any rate, pre-Exilic; of few could it be said with much confidence that they belonged to the period verging on the Greek domination; while as to Isaiah, the

[1] Iranian influence was not and could not be confined to the Iranian lands. Zoroastrian ideas were (as I observed in Lecture I.) in the air, and circulated freely throughout the empire. This was facilitated, so far as Israel was concerned, by the constant intercourse which existed between the Jews of Persia and Mesopotamia and those of Palestine. Cf. the quotation from Grätz, p. 256, note.

[2] See *The Sacred Poetry of Early Religions* (1874).

last twenty-seven chapters belonged, as a whole, to the close of the Babylonian Exile. This moderate conservatism was not without a temporary justification; it enforced greater circumspection alike on the advanced critics and on Christian apologists. It has, however, ceased to be undeniably predominant among critics, and we may venture to take this as a sign that the need of it is passing away. A criticism which is not indeed entirely new, but which may seem so, because it has hitherto been unfashionable, and which has certainly learned while in disgrace to know its own mind better and to strengthen its defences, has come, or is coming, to the front. Its claim is, not to have settled everything, but to have offered solutions of some biblical problems which may be modified and expanded, but cannot be altogether overthrown. Now the acceptance of those solutions has a direct and important bearing on exegesis. It at once gives historical probability to interpretations which twenty years ago seemed irreconcilable with the chronological position of certain books. If, for instance, the Psalms be, with few if any exceptions, written in the post-Exile period, it is no longer anachronistic to assume in some of the psalmists a large development of religious thought, stimulated in no slight degree by the kindred Persian religion. I do not mean that we are perfectly free to assert, as the old interpreters asserted, the presence of late ideas whenever it may for any reason be convenient. We are only entitled to admit them when, besides being favoured by criticism, they help instead of hindering the connection of thought. For instance, even if Job should turn out to be most probably a post-Exilic work (this question requires a re-examination), we must not admit a reference to the Resurrection, or even to the "beatific vision" alone, in Job xix. 26, 27, because (apart from the difficulty and probable corruption of the text) such a reference would be altogether inconsistent with the connection. But there are, at any rate, some passages in the later Hebrew Scriptures where this is not the case, and where what I may call a Zoroastrianising interpretation is in harmony with the context, and adds fulness and richness to the meaning. May I add that there is one more limitation which I should like to impose on those who may apply this theory to the Psalms? These poems were, with very few exceptions, intended for liturgical use. It seems to me reasonable to suppose that the writers both anticipated and sanctioned diverse interpretations of certain expressions. It was long before such ideas as the resurrection and the higher immortality became a part of the popular orthodoxy. The psalmists could not have desired to exclude all who were not as advanced as themselves from the use of their works. Not merely because they were Eastern poets, but in obedience probably to the law of charity, they used vague expressions which needed to be explained mentally from the stock of ideas which the worshippers brought with them. To those whose religious position was the comparatively dry and meagre one of the older orthodoxy of Israel, those expressions had a dry and meagre sense; but to those who were being led to the confines of a nobler faith the same words acquired a depth of significance which the older interpreters only erred in making too logically definite. I would have the expositor recognise in such cases this willingly accepted ambiguity, and admit the legitimacy of two diverse interpretations.

Let us now turn to certain books which most probably belong to the late Persian and early Greek period, and read some passages over again in a Zoroastrian light.[1] I must ask you provisionally to accept my own conclusions as to the dates of the biblical and Zoroastrian writings. The grounds of these conclusions you will naturally seek elsewhere—for instance (not to speak now of the Avesta), in those two lectures on the Problems of the Second Isaiah which I delivered here this term.[2] My present object is not to prove to you the comparative accuracy of my critical theories, but to show you what some of them come to when applied in illustration of exegesis. And in order to do this, I must read certain passages with you in the light of my theory that the Jewish Church, at the time when they were written, was not uninfluenced by Zoroastrianism. Let us not be discouraged at the vagueness and even the variety of the expressions; there is vagueness and variety enough in the Zoroastrian Scriptures, though the fundamental beliefs of the early Zoroastrianism are sufficiently well known.[3] But let us always remember that, on the present hypothesis, the Jewish Church is less developed religiously than the Zoroastrian Church of the same period; we must, therefore, be especially on our guard against assuming a logically formulated doctrine. The passages to which we shall refer are:—(*a*) Isa. xxv. 8, xxvi. 19; (*b*) Isa. lxv. 17–25, lxvi. 22;

[1] The reader must always bear in mind the qualifications of my theory. Persian influence upon the Jews was both direct and indirect. It was strongest upon those of Persia and Mesopotamia, but far from insignificant upon those of Palestine. But even the former can by no means be supposed to have read the Zoroastrian writings. Does this admission ruin my theory? Surely not. The ideas of book-religions are not propagated even now merely by their religious books. It must also be constantly remembered that Zoroastrian influence was limited by Jewish presuppositions. Even the demon Aeshma-deva (Asmodeus) was Hebraised as to his functions.

[2] These lectures will appear in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for July and October 1891.

[3] The prevalence of the resurrection-belief in the Achœmenian period is hardly doubtful. But that it was questioned by some (we know not exactly when), must be inferred from the Bundeshesh (see Spiegel, *Eran. Alterthümer*, ii. 160).

(*c*) Dan. xii. 2; (*d*) Ps. xlix. 15, 16; (*e*) Ps. xvii. 15; (*f*) Ps. xvi. 10, 11; (*g*) Ps. lxxiii. 24–27; (*h*) Ps. xxi. 5; (*i*) Ps. xlv. 3; (*k*) Ps. lxi. 7; (*l*) Ps. lxxii. 5; (*m*) Ps. lxiii. 9, 10; (*n*) Ps. xi. 7 (cf. cxl. 14); (*o*) Ps. xli. 13*b*; (*p*) Ps. xxxvi. 10. You will notice that I have put the prophetic passages first—this is because they are the easiest to interpret definitely; also that I have adopted the Hebrew numeration of the verses.

(*a*) Isa. xxv. 7, 8. This passage belongs to a most interesting but highly artificial work, such as the devout students and imitators of Scripture produced in the post-Exile period. This is a result which is now more and more commonly accepted by critics, and the only question is whether the work belongs to the first or to the second century of Persian rule. To me the latter alternative seems by far the easier one, though I am not prepared to give a historical explanation of all the circumstances alluded to in the prophecy. Nor do I deny the possibility that somewhat older passages may have been found with his own composition by this very late prophet.

Let me try to paraphrase and explain this great prophetic utterance.—The sense of mortality has hitherto been to all nations like a mourner's veil (cf. lxi. 3, corrected text), stifling all natural joy, and restraining the expression of activity. But now, Jehovah having in the fullest sense "become King," it is fitting that all who in many tongues acknowledge Him should realise in their own persons what it is to be in communion with the "living God." Hitherto tears have been a commoner sight than smiles, but now the basis of redeemed human nature shall be joy (cf. lxv. 18). Hitherto it has been Shéol which has swallowed up (cf. V. 14), but now both death and the unseen realm of death shall, by a solemn act of the King in His capital city, be themselves swallowed up.

Now I will not deny *à priori* that a devout and illuminated thinker might have inferred the future destruction of death from certain fundamental elements of his religion, but it is a striking fact that even such a great prophet as the Second Isaiah did not do so. We cannot leave the difference between the earlier and the later prophet unaccounted for. May not the secret of it be that the one prophet was open, and the other not, to Zoroastrian influences? For it is the glory of the religion of Zarathustra that it has always placed the destruction of death in the forefront of its teaching.

But was the later prophet really so open to Zoroastrian influences? From his date he ought to have been, and from the passage which we group with Isa. xxv. 8, we can, I think, see that he was. I cannot, of course, stop to justify my view of Isa. xxvi. 19, but this is what the passage in its context seems to me to mean. There are two aspects of death to this prophet—the one comforting, the other discouraging. "Dead men live not; shades rise not (again)," ver. 14. Such is the course of nature; there is no fear that those "other lords besides Jehovah" (Nineveh and Babylon, not Persia, which is in a certain sense a worshipper of Jehovah) who have led Israel captive will renew their oppression. This is a consolation. But here is the reverse side of the picture. "We have been with child, we have been in pain, we have as it were brought forth wind; we have not brought the land into full salvation, neither were inhabitants of the world born" (ver. 18).

In other words, the prophecies of restored Israel's happiness have not been fulfilled, and, in particular, whether from famines or from some other of the manifold miseries of the second Persian century, Israel's land is now insufficiently peopled. Cyrus gave but a faint shadow of "salvation," which, with all its efforts, the people of Jehovah cannot make more real. So the Church-nation, in whose name the prophet speaks, casts itself upon the divine faithfulness, and by a mighty act of faith supplicates, or, shall I say? demands, that Jehovah's dead (faithful Israelites of the latter time) may live, and that Israel's dead bodies (which have, perhaps, been "given as food to the birds of heaven," Ps. lxxix. 2) may arise Those bodies are a precious seed, which the dew of Jehovah, which is the "dew of lights," can bring to light. You will tell me that this was a perfectly legitimate inference from the old prophecy of the revival of the dry bones of the collective nation (Ezek. xxxvii. 1–10), which, as the later prophet saw, implied the revival of each member of the nation. But why is it that no one drew this inference before? Read the passage in the light of Zoroastrianism, and you will find an answer. Its spirit is thoroughly Zoroastrian, and the singular phrase "dew of lights" may be illustrated from the Avesta, where the "endless lights" are the highest heaven where Ahura Mazda dwells. The Church, in ver. 19, is not the recipient of a new revelation; the Zoroastrianising belief in a resurrection must already be current among some, or even many, of its members. Nor need we be surprised to read only of a limited resurrection, for Zoroastrian influence was necessarily limited by Jewish presuppositions. But is there not a discrepancy between xxv. 8 and xxvi. 19? For nothing is said in the former passage of resurrection, nor in the latter of immortality. True; but this is an example of that variety of statement of which I have already spoken. Obviously the two passages were not written at quite the same time, and Ewald thinks that they are not by the same author. But even upon Ewald's hypothesis, the writer who combined them must have considered them reconcilable. And surely they are so. Take them together, and you get a consistent picture of the "last things,"

viz. that the deceased faithful Israelites will rise again, and together with those who shall be alive in the Messianic period (and, of course, the converts from "all nations") live for ever.

(*b*) Isa. lxv. 17–25.—These verses, which belong to the latest of the passages added to the great Prophecy of Restoration, and to be referred (as I have sought to prove) to the closing part of the Persian period. It is at first, however, very difficult to read them in a Persian light, and even to seize their characteristic idea in its purity, because of the conventionality of the style. It will be helpful to look both at the nearer and at the more distant context (*i.e.* the statements of chap. lxvi. must not be left out of account). Those who believe that they can trace different hands may be reminded that it is no slight thing to get at the meaning which the latest of the writers (who cannot have lived much later than the earliest) gave to the passage. Now, taking lxvi. 18–24 into account, we cannot hesitate to conclude that the time to which the prophecy points is (in the larger sense of the term) the Messianic period, which the writer believes to be close at hand. It is in this period, which is introduced by the last great judgment upon the hostile powers of the world, that Jehovah says that He will "create new heavens and a new earth" (lxv. 17), which, unlike the old, "shall stand perpetually before me" (lxvi. 22). What is the meaning of this? From the older parts of the Book of Isaiah we see that the final transformation of nature in accordance with the changed fortunes of Israel formed part of the prophetic ideal (see xi. 6–9, xxx. 26, xxxv. 1, 2, 6, 7), and twice (xxxiii. 24, xxxv. 5, 6) the removal of bodily infirmities forms part of a Messianic description. Antediluvian longevity is not elsewhere referred to in such a context, and the mention of sinners in the new Jerusalem is in seeming contradiction (I cannot pause to account for this) to the earlier Messianic promises, Isa. xxxiii. 24, xxxv. 8. At first sight, then, our prophet is developing eschatological germs of genuine Israelitish origin, except in two points which have no affinity to anything in Zoroastrianism.

But let us look a little closer at the passage in its context; we may perhaps have mistaken its meaning, or missed something which modifies it in some essential respect. This strange description may be merely a concession to the weak brethren, like the epilogue of Job, according to the prevailing opinion of commentators. Is there anything in the context which favours this view? Yes, if at least we take the next chapter into account. In lxvi. 24 we read, "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have rebelled against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorrence unto all flesh." It is, I know, common to say that these words only refer to the unburied bodies of the dead enemies, which are supposed, by a survival of primitive thought, to retain the consciousness of pain. The sight of the unburied and still tormented bodies will, according to this view of the writer's meaning, fill the spectators with an awful sense of the divine justice. But, on a closer observation, it is but half the primitive theory which this interpretation gives us. The connection of soul and body is not supposed by the child-man to be broken by death. The perpetuation of pain in the dead body necessarily involves the perpetuation of pain in the soul, or in that *eidolon* of a body which belongs to the soul in the underworld.[1] The divine justice, therefore, pursues the wicked after death; this is part of what the prophet means, though with seemly reserve he leaves it unspoken. You may object that the words of an author are the sole data of the commentators. But is this true? For my own part I think that we have not only to study the words of an author (a mere linguist can do this), but sedulously to think ourselves into his mental and emotional situation. The psalmists and prophets continually leave things to be supplied by the reader,[2] and our prophet does so here.

And now can we not see that Isa. lxv. 17–25 and lxvi. 24 express or imply mutually complementary ideas? The explanation which I offer is probably as old as the earliest writer in Enoch. It seems to me none the worse on this account; the history of early exegesis may sometimes suggest neglected exegetical truths. I need not add that I am as far as possible from wishing to adopt the developed eschatology of any later writer. Briefly, then, my view of the prophet's meaning is this. He admits, in defiance to the weaker brethren, and against the letter of Zoroastrianism, that death continues to exist in the new creation, but the death which he means is no evil. For the divine justice, which echoes within the human heart, demands not only everlasting pain, but everlasting happiness. "My servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed" (lxv. 13). Now the shame of rebellion, as the prophet distinctly says in lxvi. 24, must be perpetual (lxvi. 24); how, then, should the joy of redemption be limited to a few hundred years of life? And how can perpetual joy be attained but through death? Now the lastingness of future rewards and punishments is a thoroughly Zoroastrian conception,[3] which must have had a stimulating influence for good and for evil on later Jewish thought.

So too is that of the new heaven and the new

[1] See the notes on Isa. lvii. 2, lxvi. 24, in my commentary.

[2] Comp. Delitzsch's striking description of the condensed Hebrew and indeed Oriental style in his early work, *Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*, p. 189.

[3] The tradition of the destruction of hell in Bundeshesh, xxx. 31, 32 (West's translation), is self-evidently the product of late theological reflection—late, that is, in comparison with the period of the Achœmenidæ.

earth. Our prophet may indeed have had in his mind two passages of the Second Isaiah (li. 16, l. 11), as he wrote lxv. 17 (lxvi. 22) and lxvi. 24 respectively; but there is a wide difference between the glowing poetical style of the former and the cool, deliberate, not to say dogmatic manner of the latter, which implies a different situation, and can be partly accounted for by Zoroastrian influence on the later Jews. It is by no means fatal to this view that our prophet does not copy Zoroastrian details, for instance, the destruction of the old world by fire (see 2 Peter iii. 10).

[We are compelled to do Canon Cheyne the injustice of breaking off his article at this point. The larger and more important portion of it which remains will appear in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for August.—EDITOR.]

Recent Literature on the Writings of St. John.

LITERATURE ON THE WHOLE FIELD.

1. *Introduction to the Johannine Writings.* By PATON J. GLOAG, D.D., Minister of Galashiels. London: James Nisbet & Co. 8vo, pp. xvii, 440. 1891, 10s. 6d.
2. *The Writers of the New Testament, their Style and Characteristics.* By the late Rev. WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX, M.A., Rector of Harlaxton. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Crown 8vo, pp. viii, 190. 1890, 2s. 6d.
3. *The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times; their Diversity and Unity in Life and Doctrine.* By GOTTHARD VICTOR LECHLER, D.D., Ordinary Professor of Theology in Leipzig. Third Edition, thoroughly revised and rewritten; translated by A. J. K. DAVIDSON. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 2 vols., cr. 8vo, pp. xxv, 756. 1886, 16s.
4. *Word Studies in the New Testament.* By MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. II., "The Writings of John." London: James Nisbet & Co. 8vo, pp. 607, 16s.

It is marvellous that Dr. Paton Gloag, upon whom there lies so much responsibility of another kind, should have been able to produce a work of the magnitude of this *Introduction to the Johannine Writings.* And the marvel is the greater when we remember his previous *magna opera*, some of which have been but a short time in our hands, his Introductions to the Pauline and to the Catholic Epistles, his Commentary on the Acts, his Baird Lectures on Messianic Prophecy, and his volume of Exegetical Studies. It is another instance in support of the saying that the busiest man has the most time to spare. It would therefore be a poor compliment either to the proverb or to Dr. Gloag to judge the book otherwise than wholly and strictly upon its merits. And there is the less need, since its merits are most where they might be expected to be weakest. There is neither dazzling brilliancy of language, nor dashing originality of thought, but everywhere there are traces of wide reading and patient hearing, of clear judgment and plain, finished statement. Of a certain book, entitled *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, astonishment has been unkindly professed at the candour of the title. But here, though the subject is great, the study is not short. One thing is manifest above all others, that Dr. Gloag has put into his introduction much conscientious hard work. At the head of each department the literature is given. In no case is the list complete, but the subsequent chapter shows that it has been chosen after personal acquaintance: it is exhausted if not exhaustive. And here and there passing reference to a recent German pamphlet marks the modern open-eyed scholar. Dr. Gloag's position is conservative. It is the beloved apostle who gave us Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse. But not even the critic who comes with an absolute negative is denied audience, or his case prejudiced in the statement.

The subject of Mr. Simcox's little book is Style. An earlier volume describes the Greek of the New Testament as a whole, its character as distinguished from classical Greek. In this the several writers of the New Testament are compared with one another as to their peculiarities of language. The writings of St. John occupy barely twenty pages, so that even the limited subject chosen is little more than touched upon. But every line is precious. With the Greek Testament in hand the book must be used, and then it will repay the patient student richly. Once and again in a short sentence some principle is stated: "We feel that, if St. John has an imperfect command of Greek idiom, he has a quite adequate command of Greek vocabulary; he frames his sentences as he can, but he chooses his words as he will." "It does not follow that his language as it is, is not better for the purpose than that of a better Greek scholar." But even these are rare; for the most part the inductions are left to the student's own discernment and patience.

Dr. Lechler's volumes, like Mr. Simcox's little

work, cover a larger field than St. John, whose writings occupy the fifth section, that is to say, pages 163 to 213 of the second volume. The subject is Doctrine. The book needs no lengthy notice, but demands an emphatic testimony to its singular worth. Professor Lechler's scholarship is above all suspicion. He is in living sympathy with his subject, and his conservative position does not impair either his independence or his discernment. No better introduction to the theology of the New Testament could a student take into his hands. It appeals to a wide circle, for it is not beyond the reach of any one, and few will boast that they are beyond the reach of it.

Both Greek and English words are studied in Dr. Marvin Vincent's book. The studies are for the most part exegetical, but also historical, geographical, and especially doctrinal. Their aim is not high, and therefore, perhaps, all the more useful to those for whom they are intended. Here and there the studies open out into a discussion of considerable length and also of considerable acuteness, such as that on the Symbols of the Apocalypse and that on 1 John iii. 19–22.

THE GOSPEL.

1. *Modern Criticism considered in its relation to the Fourth Gospel:* Being the Bampton Lectures for 1890. By HENRY WILLIAM WATKINS, M.A., D.D., Archdeacon and Canon of Durham, and Professor of Hebrew in the University of Durham. London: John Murray. 8vo, pp. xxxix, 502. 1890, 14s.
2. *Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students: The Gospel according to St. John, with Introduction and Notes.* By Rev. GEORGE REITH, M.A., Glasgow. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 2 vols., cr. 8vo, pp. lxi, 314. 1889, 4s.
3. *Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools: The Gospel according to St. John, with Maps, Notes, and Introduction.* By the Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham. Cambridge: At the University Press. Cr. 8vo, pp. lxiv, 380. 1882, 6s.
4. *The Gospel according to St. John, with Notes Critical and Practical.* By the Rev. M. F. SADLER, Rector of Honiton, and Prebendary of Wells. Fourth Edition. London: George Bell & Sons. Cr. 8vo, pp. xl, 517. 1889, 7s. 6d.
5. *The Gospel of St. John: An Exposition exegetical and homiletical, for the use of Clergymen, Students, and Teachers.* By Rev. THOMAS WHITELAW, M.A., D.D. Cheaper Issue. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons. 8vo, pp. lxii, 464. 1891, 7s. 6d.
6. *An Exposition of the Gospel of St. John, consisting of an Analysis of each chapter, and of a Commentary, critical, exegetical, doctrinal, and moral.* By His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. MACEVILLY, Archbishop of Tuam. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. Royal 8vo, pp. 382. 1889, 10s. 6d.
7. *The Biblical Illustrator.* By Rev. JOSEPH S. EXELL, M.A. *St. John*, Vol. I. London: James Nisbet & Co. 8vo, pp. xxv, 674. 1891, 7s. 6d.

"The Johannine problem," says Dr. Schaff in a letter to Dr. Gloag, and printed by the latter in his Introduction, "is the most difficult in the literature of the New Testament. That Gospel is a mystery as the work of the beloved disciple, but a still greater mystery if the work of some unknown Christian Plato of the second century. Hase says that one risks his scientific reputation nowadays (in Germany) by conceding the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel; but significantly adds, 'It has not been so once, and it may not be so always.' I strongly hope and believe that some master-critic will rise before long to turn the tables, and to restore once more this Gospel of Gospels to its rightful place, which it held in the heart of Christendom from St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom down to Schleiermacher and Lücke."

This was the opportunity presented to Dr. Watkins; but a most undue modesty has prevented him from accepting it. It is this that men will look for in the fine volume which contains the Bampton Lectures of 1890, but it is something much less, though not less interesting, that they will find. Dr. Watkins may complain that he should be judged for not doing what he did not attempt to do. But the complaint is ours, that he did not attempt what this volume itself shows he has many of the gifts for doing. Keim said, in reference to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, "Our age has cancelled the judgment of centuries." Dr. Watkins has been content to prove that sentence untrue. He has proved it; the general effect of the book is to confirm us in the belief of the Johannine authorship; but it is the literature of the problem, rather than the problem itself, that occupies its pages. The two last lectures are the most independent, and show what might have been; the first six are chiefly valuable for the nearly exhaustive account they offer of the massive literature — German, French, English, Dutch — that has gathered round this problem.

It will be seen at once from the list given above that recent literature upon St. John's Gospel is rich and full. But it is not all named above. Four great Commentaries are omitted — the *Speaker*, Dr. Schaff's, Dr. Ellicott's, and the *Pulpit*. Much

of the work in these Commentaries is of the highest order. It may almost be said that from Bishop Westcott's *St. John's Gospel* in the *Speaker*, modern exposition takes a new beginning. But Dr. Reynolds has produced a work on the same Gospel in the *Pulpit* that will rank alongside of Westcott's. Again, while one is loth to pass over Milligan and Moulton in "Schaff," Dr. Pope's exposition of the Epistles in the same Commentary deserves most special mention. But to include these Commentaries within the present survey would extend it to quite unmanageable dimensions. The separately issued works which demand notice are themselves numerous enough.

The Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students include such works as Davidson's *Hebrews* and Dods's *Post-Exilian Prophets*, and to Mr. Reith was set the task of writing a Commentary on St. John's Gospel which would rank with books like these. It was long in coming. But when it came, no one grudged the time, no one complained that the trust had been misplaced. It may be held to be axiomatic that startling effects in exegesis are the green fruits of study, fuller knowledge returns to the old paths. The very "antiquity," if we may use the word, of Mr. Reith's exposition proves its thoroughness. He never grows weary, he never becomes wearisome. His knowledge of his forerunners is unobtrusive, but we may find out its reality. His own decision is made by his own judgment. He knows his author as well as his author's editors. It is an unpretending book, but the opinion of one who has used it is that it is a right faithful work, and will last.

The Cambridge Bible in its English form runs to a large degree parallel with the handbooks. But it holds the ground undisputed with its editions in Greek. And they are, besides, the best, so that he will always prefer to use them who can. Dr. Plummer's Greek St. John is, to our thinking, both in the Gospel and the Epistles, a distinct advance upon the English edition. Not only are the introductions fuller, not only have we the textual criticisms at the head of each chapter, the notes are frequently expressed more tersely, there is a greater richness of reference, a firmer and more confident hand is felt in the passages of deepest import. No doubt Dr. Plummer had the benefit of experience, but it is possible, we suppose, for one to be more at home in direct intercourse with the Greek itself than with a translation. It is an admirable feature of Dr. Plummer's Commentaries that he never forgets for whom he is writing them.

Prebendary Sadler describes his work accurately when he says it is critical and practical. The strictly critical notes are, however, quite subordinate, the practical reflections (the word has been abused, but not by Mr. Sadler) predominate. As example, take this on "the light of life" (John viii. 12): "Light of any sort can only be apprehended by life. The sun shines on the rock, and it feels it not, but when the sun shines on a thing which has life, the living creature takes in the light through its organ of vision, and is guided by it to fulfil its place among living creatures; and so, where Christ shines into the heart, His light brings with it not only illumination but life; as we have said, under chapter i. 4, that which corresponds to life in lower forms of creatures, becomes in renewed man moral and spiritual light." In many of the notes there is an admirable blending of exposition and application; or rather the practical application often proves itself the truest exposition, for always the Commentary is true to its intention, which is not to give an exegesis of the Gospel, or even an exposition, but to make a modern application of its everlasting truths.

"It stands to reason that the sight of one Holy Catholic Church, immense in numbers, purifying itself from sin, rich in good works of faith and charity, and withal presenting one undivided front, would be overwhelming. Men may call this a dream, but it is a dream for the realisation of which Christ here prays." Such is Prebendary Sadler's comment on John xvii. 21: "that they all may be one . . . that the world may believe." Dr. MacEvilly at least will not call it a dream: with the wish, with the prayer he is heartily in accord. But surely an early step towards its realisation is that the professed expositors of the words of Christ should be one. It is true that the Commentary of the Archbishop of Tuam is not seriously separated from Prebendary Sadler's, or even from Mr. Reith's, in the interpretation of the ordinary narrative; but in how many places of immense significance are they sharply opposed, and to all appearance irreconcilable. In the sixth chapter of this Gospel, Dr. MacEvilly discovers a plain statement of the "Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist." Our other expositors discover nothing of the kind, though they are not agreed among themselves as to what they do discover there. Still less are they in harmony with Dr. MacEvilly in his interpretation of the words, "Woman, behold thy Son," spoken by the Saviour to His mother, as she stood with the beloved disciple near the cross (xix. 26). In this short sentence Dr. MacEvilly sees both a literal and a mystical meaning; that is to say, the word "woman" refers to Mary, but the word "Son" represents "the human race, or at least the sincere followers of our Divine Lord." And "are *we* not then," he asks, "the children

whom Mary brought forth in sorrow at the foot of the cross, the children recommended to her by her dying first-born?" "Then," he goes on, "turning to us in the person of St. John, He exclaims, 'Behold thy mother!'" from which there flows a long and earnest appeal to us *on the ground of this command* to reverence and adore the Blessed Virgin. But let it not be concluded that there is no profit in this Commentary; Dr. MacEvilly is for the most part as Protestant in his interpretations as any other, and weighs the various views of a difficult passage with an apparently impartial and steady hand. Moreover, we are constrained at times joyfully to confess that he is able to make fresh truth break forth from the old familiar Gospel.

Still it is a long step from Dr. MacEvilly to Dr. Whitelaw. The nature of Dr. Whitelaw's Commentary will be understood when it is described as similar to the *Pulpit Commentary* without the homilies. The exposition is full, fuller perhaps than in the *Pulpit*, and is succeeded by the homiletics at the close of each large section. Seeing that the *Pulpit* St. John is so expensive, this is the best accessible commentary on the Gospel for preachers who wish to have homiletical help at hand. Dr. Whitelaw is a ripe and healthy scholar, his exegesis may be trusted, and his publishers have done their work in a way that deserves much gratitude. This is the book for those who want their money's worth.

Let Mr. Exell's Biblical Illustrator close this part of the survey. Only the first volume of St. John's Gospel has yet been issued. It covers the first seven chapters. The Biblical Illustrator is *all* homiletical, a great storehouse, in very truth one of the marvels of the day.

THE EPISTLES.

1. *The Epistles of St. John: The Greek Text, with Notes and Essays.* By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Durham. London: Macmillan & Co. 8vo, pp. lvi, 360. 1883, 12s. 6d.
2. *The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges: The Epistles of St. John, with Notes, Introduction, and Appendices.* By the Rev. A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham. Cambridge: At the University Press. Cr. 8vo, pp. xcviii, 204. 1886, 4s. 6d.
3. *The First Epistle of St. John, with Exposition and Homiletical Treatment.* By the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A., Vicar of St. Edward's, Cambridge. London: James Nisbet & Co. Cr. 8vo, pp. 424. 1887, 6s.
4. *The Expositor's Bible. The Epistles of St. John: Twenty-one Discourses, with Greek Text, Comparative Versions, and Notes, chiefly exegetical.* By WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D., D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Cr. 8vo, pp. xvi, 309. 1889, 7s. 6d.

One sometimes wonders why, when a great satisfying commentary has been written on some book of Scripture, any more commentaries should be written on that book. Perhaps it is good for the writers of the other commentaries, since, without the writing, they might not know the book. Perhaps it is because some men invariably prefer the middling to the great and good, their favourite copy-book quotation being about something "not too bright and good for human nature's daily food." But also, perhaps, there are different kinds of commentaries, as of poetry, and each kind may have its best, which is as good as the best of some other kind. Thus it was seen that in recent literature on the Gospel of St. John there were the preacher's, the student's, the practical, the devotional, the English, and the Greek. It will not, therefore, follow that, when one comes upon a commentary that may with confidence be pronounced exceedingly fine, and nearly all that a commentary may be, it is useless to mention any other after it. Dr. Westcott's is such a commentary. He who has it and can use it will not seek any other. But it needs a student of Greek, and a patient student besides, one ready and willing to read and read over again, to turn up references, and meditate upon allusions, ready also to unlearn much and open the mind and heart to new stirring thoughts and untried emotions. Therefore, by the side of Bishop Westcott's Epistles of St. John there is room for others.

There is room for Dr. Plummer's commentary, because you could not send a lad at school, scarcely an average undergraduate, to Westcott. Even skilled linguists and exegetes speak of a mysticism in Westcott, which probably means that the richness of his thought, and learning, and devotion, is hard even for them to follow. But Dr. Plummer's book is quite the best we have of its kind, and will prove an admirable preliminary and introduction to his bishop's. Its introduction is exceptionally full and valuable, there are nine most interesting appendices, and the notes are certainly not inferior to those of the Gospel.

Mr. Lias divides the Epistle into sections, expounds each section verse by verse and clause by clause with considerable fulness, and adds at the bottom of every page a brief homiletical treatment of the greatest passages. Mr. Lias is a scholar

and a tried expositor. His work is always faithful and trustworthy. English readers and preachers who come to this volume from others of his will not be disappointed, and they need not shrink from the occasional Greek word, since the meaning is scarcely interrupted by it.

The title "Expositor's Bible" already covers no little variety, and Dr. Alexander's Epistles of St. John is in some respects quite unlike any other of the series. He tells us that the book contains twenty-one discourses, but also "Greek text, comparative versions, and notes, chiefly exegetical." There is some confusion at present in the use of the words sermon, lecture, and discourse. These discourses were surely never preached as ordinary sermons, for the matter is sometimes somewhat academical for the ordinary sermon. But there is much preaching material and preaching power in them. Thus, "'That ye may not sin' (1 John ii. 1) is the bold, universal language of the morality of God. Men only understand moral teaching when it comes with a series of monographs on the virtues—sobriety, chastity, and the rest. Christianity does not overlook these, but it comes first with all-inclusive principles. The morality of man is like the sculptor working line by line and part by part, partially and successively. The morality of God is like nature, and works in every part of the flower and tree with a sort of ubiquitous presence." The printing of the "comparative versions" is a scarcely intelligible feature, being arrested somewhere, either in the conception or the working out. But the notes are fresh and modern. More of them would not have been amiss.

THE APOCALYPSE.

1. *Vision of the Ages: Lectures on the Apocalypse.* By B. W. Johnson. London: Office of the *Christian Commonwealth.* Cr. 8vo, pp. xiv, 360, 4s.
2. *The Revelation of St. John: The Baird Lecture,* 1885. By William Milligan, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. London: Macmillan & Co. Cr. 8vo, pp. xix, 343. 1886, 7s. 6d.
3. *The Expositor's Bible. The Book of Revelation.* By William Milligan, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Cr. 8vo, pp. viii, 392. 1889, 7s. 6d.
4. *The Great Day of the Lord: A Survey of New Testament Teaching on Christ's Coming in His Kingdom, the Resurrection, and the Judgment of the Living and the Dead.* By the Rev. Alexander Brown, Aberdeen. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co. Cr. 8vo, pp. x, 260. 1890, 3s. 6d.
5. *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. The Revelation of St. John the Divine, with Notes and Introduction.* By the late Rev. William Henry Simcox, M.A., Rector of Harlaxton. Cambridge: At the University Press. Cr. 8vo, pp. lx, 174. 1890, 3s.
6. *The Practical Teaching of the Apocalypse.* By the Rev. G. V. Garland, Rector of Binstead, Isle of Wight. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 8vo, pp. x, 498. 1891, 16s.
7. *The Apocalypse: Its Structure and Primary Predictions.* By David Brown, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Aberdeen. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Cr. 8vo, pp. xi, 224. 1891, 5s.

In respect of all books on the Apocalypse, the first question still is, What is their system of interpretation? There are three systems of interpretation, the Preterist, the Continuous, and the Futurist; to which, however, it now seems necessary to add a fourth, which may be called the Idealist. The words explain themselves. According to the Preterist system, the Apocalypse describes events of the writer's own time, in particular the fall of Jerusalem and heathen Rome. These events are *past* for us. Some well-known commentators have held this view, as Ewald, Lücke, Moses Stuart, Maurice, S. Davidson, and Desprez. According to the Continuous (or Historical) system, the Apocalyptic visions relate to events which are spread over the whole history of the Church. Some have been fulfilled already, some are in process of fulfilment now, some await their fulfilment yet. It is a *continuous* prophecy, a foresight of the history of the world in respect at least of its great events. Bengel, Hengstenberg, Elliot, Wordsworth, Alford, Lee, are amongst the "Historical" interpreters. The Futurist theory has had few advocates of the first rank, the best known being Isaac Williams. The fulfilment of the prophecies in the Apocalypse still lies, it is said, in the *future*, beyond the second advent of Christ. Some separate the first three chapters of the book, though some look for their fulfilment also in the events of the Parousia. The Idealist method is comparatively recent, at least as a distinct consistent scheme of interpretation. The Apocalyptic visions are not predictions of definite events either in the past, present, or future. They are symbolic representations of great *ideas* or principles, which will manifest themselves in every age of the Church under every variety of circumstance.

Dr. Milligan of Aberdeen, if he has not invented the Idealist system of interpretation, has certainly brought it into the rank of a regular system, and has identified himself very closely as an expositor with it. Besides the exposition of the Apoca-

lypse in Schaff's Commentary, he has written the two books named in the list above. The Baird lecture contains the principles of his interpretation, the Expositor's Bible applies them in a series of discourses. His own words as to the scheme followed are these: "While the Apocalypse embraces the whole period of the Christian dispensation, it sets before us within this period the action of great principles and not special incidents. . . . This book thus becomes to us not a history of either early or mediæval or last events, written of before they happened, but a spring of elevating encouragement and holy joy to Christians in every age" (Baird Lecture, p. 155). The system has not met with support hitherto. Indeed, it has been frequently and sharply criticised. But it is manifest that the value of Dr. Milligan's books does not depend upon the validity of the system. The great principles are great principles, and are *in* the Apocalypse whether they are *of* it or not, and many passages of great beauty and eloquence will be found devoted to their elucidation and application.

Mr. Johnson is a "continuous" interpreter, and a more fearless and definite exponent of that scheme is not to be found. The first seal (Rev. vi. 2–4) describes "the glorious period of Roman history, A.D. 96 to A.D. 180." The fifth vial (Rev. xvi. 10, 11) represents "the uprising of Italy and the overthrow of the States of the Church, 1866 to 1880." The events of the seventh vial (Rev. xvi. 18–21) "are yet future, and are followed by the total overthrow of Babylon, and the Millennium." These are three instances chosen out of many where the time and event are equally precise. The system, as Dr. Davidson recently said, is not in favour at present,—though Principal Brown's book (noticed elsewhere by Professor Banks) is historical also, but without the minuteness and precision of Mr. Johnson,—yet it has a great fascination. Dr. Milligan's system, with all his skill, is dull reading in comparison. Mr. Johnson is an American writer, and not only has thorough confidence in his method, but does actually bring about many most surprising results, so that it is by no means easy to avoid agreeing with him, and quite impossible to escape a keen interest in the progress of the work.

Mr. Simcox and Mr. Brown are Preterists. Mr. Simcox's book was reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May by Professor A. B. Davidson. Mr. Brown's deserves more notice than it is possible to give it. Outwardly most unattractive, it is in itself an exceedingly able and deeply interesting study of this strange book on the lines of interpretation which most prevail at present. Mr. Brown is both a scholar and an independent thinker, nor is his style less vigorous than his thought. He exposes the weak places in other schemes mercilessly, and he is watchful over the dangers which beset his own.

The last book on our list is Mr. Garland's *Practical Teaching of the Apocalypse.* It is difficult to place; for it does not follow wholly any of the systems named. Its leading principle is undoubtedly idealist, for it discovers in the visions of the seer great principles to warn and guide the Church in every age. But it is not purely idealist, since it frequently finds these principles incarnated in actual events of past, present, and future ages. Of *future* ages also, for Mr. Garland becomes himself in some sense a seer, as when he sees rising out of the present political position in Ireland an establishment of the Roman Catholic religion over the British Isles. The practical teaching of the Apocalypse is, as Dr. Milligan also would say, teaching equally suited for every age of the world, and there are many earnest counsels in this volume for the end of the nineteenth century. But sometimes the practical teaching rests upon so surprising an interpretation, that one forgets the personal application in wonder at the ingenuity of the method which secures it.

The Structure of the Apocalypse.

The Apocalypse: its Structure and Primary Predictions. By DAVID BROWN, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1891. 5s.

THE venerable author gives us here some last words on the last and most difficult book of Scripture. He does not profess to give a complete exposition, but simply hints and key-words. Still, we are not left in doubt as to the line which a full exposition from his hands would take. He stands on the old ways with regard both to the date and the interpretation of the Apocalypse. The reasons which satisfy Dr. Brown are stated with great clearness and vigour. All the features of the book for him tell against an early date. His conclusion is, "For myself I cannot believe it." The difference in style is due to the difference of the subject-matter (p. 11). So, as to the meaning of the book, Dr. Brown holds by a Pagan and a Papal persecution as the two fixed quantities. Expositors will scarcely go back to this position. But no satisfactory theory has yet been suggested in lieu of the old one. Certainly the "descriptive" interpretation, favoured by Dr. Milligan and others, is not likely to gain acceptance. The elementary

truths which the book is supposed to teach "are themselves infinitely plainer than the book which we are told was written to enforce them."

Dr. Brown reprints a reply which he wrote years ago to Sir W. Hamilton's attack on the Apocalypse. "My only reason for reprinting it here is that it gives a number of curious and interesting biographical facts which it took me a good deal of time to hunt out, and which should not go quite out of sight." The essay was worth reprinting also for other reasons. It is a capital specimen of hard-hitting polemics.

Our author also is not sorry to break a lance with the Revisers over some of the readings they have accepted. He evidently thinks that Westcott and Hort's canons have had too great influence. He discusses at length the "impossible" and "repulsive" reading in xv. 6 (p. 219). In other cases also Dr. Brown prefers the Authorised to the Revised reading, always assigning reasons. In one instance he differs from both versions, arranging xiii. 8 thus: "All whose names are not written from the foundation of the world in the Book of Life of the Lamb that hath been slain." The independence of treatment and vivacity of style are admirable throughout.—J. S. Banks.

"Studia Biblica."

There is one feature which distinguishes the Oxford movement of to-day, the movement of Keble College and of Gore, from the earlier movement of Newman and of Oriel, that it is essentially a work of scholars, and owes its existence to the supposed demands of learning. We do not mean, of course, that scholarship was unknown in the earlier movement. But it certainly was not well known. This undeniable fact has just been stated in a fresh form, in the *Newbery House Magazine* for June, by the Rev. Nicholas Pocock, whose recollections of Oxford carry him back to the time when the "Tracts" began to be issued. "Another very noticeable point in the earlier tracts, published in the first two volumes, was the general ignorance, even of the writers themselves, as to the real sentiments and opinions of the Reformers. There was a great tendency to take for granted that the views of the Reformers of the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth were pretty much in accordance with those of the writers of the tracts. And they do not seem to have found out till they began to publish *Catenæ*—that is to say, a string of quotations from authorities of the post-Reformation English Church—that they were obliged to content themselves for the most part with extracts from the divines from James the First down to the present century."

The contrast between that and the present movement is very great. Scholarship was not necessary to Newman and his party, and it was not sought after. But scholarship is essential to the Oxford movement of to-day; the men are scholars all; out of scholarship, whether scholarship rightly used or not, the movement has arisen. And yet we do not intend to say that *Lux Mundi* is a volume of gigantic learning. Had it been so, less sensation would have come out of it. But *Lux Mundi*, though it has made the sensation of the movement, is neither its origin nor its most characteristic exponent.

Six years ago there was issued from the Clarendon Press a thin octavo volume, which went by the simple title, *Studia Biblica*. Its more explicit sub-title was, *Essays in Biblical Archæology and Criticism*. The short preface is signed by S. R. Driver, William Sanday, and John Wordsworth. In it they say: "In the autumn of the year 1883, finding ourselves recently appointed to the three chairs which represent the interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University, we took counsel together to find some means of assisting students in our department outside the formal way of instruction by lectures. Since then we have met on four Monday evenings in every term for the purpose of reading and discussing papers in Biblical Archæology and Criticism, including also some other kindred subjects, which it seemed very desirable to embrace in our programme. The essays contained in this volume have all been read at these meetings." The essays contained in the volume, and their authors, are these:—1. Recent Theories on the Origin and Nature of the Tetragrammaton. S. R. Driver, D.D. 2. The Light thrown by the Septuagint Version on the Books of Samuel. F. H. Woods, B.D. 3. On the Dialects spoken in Palestine in the Time of Christ. Ad. Neubauer, M.A. 4. On a New Theory of the Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels proposed by G. Wetzel. A. Edersheim, M.A. 5. A Commentary on the Gospels, attributed to Theophilus of Antioch. W. Sanday, M.A. 6. The Text of the Codex Rossanensis (Σ). W. Sanday. 7. The Corbey St. James (*ff*), and its Relation to other Latin versions, and to the original language of the Epistle. John Wordsworth, M.A., B.N.C. 8. A Syriac Biblical Manuscript of the Fifth Century, with special reference to its bearing on the text of the Syriac version of the Gospels. G. H. Gwilliam, M.A. 9. The Date of S. Polycarp's Martyrdom. T. Randell, M.A. 10. On some newly-discovered Temanite and Nabatæan Inscriptions. Ad. Neubauer.

At the conclusion of the few sentences of preface to this volume the Editors promise to continue the series, "should this volume be favourably received." But the volume was almost unheeded. In the

Academy it was noticed some three or four months ago, and even then not too appreciatively. The professors went on with their lectures meantime, and still found means of assisting students "outside the formal way." The second volume appeared in 1890. Ad. Neubauer, F. H. Woods, G. H. Gwilliam, and W. Sanday, of those who wrote in the first, appear again. The new names are C. H. Turner, M.A.; C. Bigg, D.D.; Ll. J. M. Bebb, M.A.; and H. J. White, M.A. The preface is signed by S. R. Driver, T. K. Cheyne, and W. Sanday.

They speak of it as a publication which has but little prospect of being remunerative. They have learned this since the first came out. But they are not disappointed. *Studia Biblica* is not a popular publication. It is not by it that England will be shaken and a new Oxford movement take visible shape before all men's eyes. The points discussed in *Studia Biblica* are too minute and technical for that. But they know that "it is just these minor points which often furnish the clue for wider investigations, and so either change the face of familiar history or enable us to penetrate into regions hitherto unexplored." Of the Oxford movement of to-day the original as well as most characteristic exponent is not *Lux Mundi* but *Studia Biblica*.

First Book of Samuel:

HINTS FOR STUDY.

By the Rev. Principal Elmer Harding, M.A., St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

1. Introduction.
   - i. Art. Smith's Bible Dictionary. "Samuel, Books of."
   - ii. Art. Studia Biblica, vol. i. "The Light thrown by the Septuagint Version on the Books of Samuel." By the Rev. F. H. Woods, B.D., St. John's College, Oxford.
   - iii. Notes, Critical and Philological, on the Hebrew Text of I. and II. Samuel. By Canon Driver.

2. Histories.
   - i. Smith's Old Testament History, pp. 310–359.
   - ii. Stanley's Jewish Church.
     - Lect. xvii. The Fall of Shiloh.
     - xviii. Samuel.
     - xix. The History of the Prophetical Order.
     - xx. The Nature of the Prophetical Teaching.
     - xxi. Saul.
     - xxii. The Youth of David.
   - iii. Geikie's Hours with the Bible, vol. iii. pp. 1–182, chaps. i.–vii.
   - iv. Edersheim's Bible History. Israel under Samuel, Saul, and David, vol. iv., chaps. i.–xv.

3. Commentaries.
   - i. Keil.
   - ii. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge Bible for Schools.
   - iii. Lord Arthur Hervey. Speaker.
   - iv. Spence. Ellicott.

4. Expositions.
   - i. *Maurice:* Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament.
   - ii. *Kingsley:* Five Sermons on David in "Gospel of Pentateuch and David."
   - iii. *Blaikie:* Expositor's Bible.

5. Biographies.
   - i. *Deane:* Men of the Bible. "Samuel and Saul."
   - ii. *Deane:* Men of the Bible. "David."
   - iii. *Stanley:* Bible Dictionary. Art. "Samuel."
   - iv. *Geikie:* Old Testament Characters (uniform with Hours with the Bible), pp. 185–227. Eli, Samuel, Saul, David, Goliath.
   - v. *Wilberforce:* Heroes of Hebrew History.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xvi. 13.

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."

Exposition.

In these four vigorous exhortations, together with that in ver. 14, the Apostle sums up the whole duty of the Corinthian converts in the trying times, and amid the varied temptations in which this epistle would find them. That duty is set forth as involving five different graces:—(1) *Watchfulness;* spiritual brightness and alacrity, opposed to "sleeping" (1 Thess. v. 6). (2) *Stedfastness in the faith,* ever a sure test whether baptismal grace is working within; contrast 2 Thess. ii. 12, "Had pleasure in unrighteousness." (3) *Christian manliness;* Vulgate, *viriliter agite.* (4) *Spiritual*

strength; compare Eph. iii. 16, "That ye may be strengthened with power by His Spirit in the inward man." And (5) *Christian love* (ver. 14).—*Ellicott.*

"*Watch ye.*" In the forefront the Apostle puts watchfulness, or rather, perhaps, wakefulness. It is that peculiarly Christian alertness which Christ in His later ministry urges upon His disciples (Matt. xxiv. 42, xxv. 13). It assumed especially the form of watching for the coming of the Lord, or against the approach of the enemy (1 Pet. v. 8); then, in a more general sense, it meant that activity and energy of soul which constitutes the power of the religious life in its realisation of spiritual things, and in prayer. It is the Christian form of the spirit's search for truth, which makes Agnosticism keenly painful.—*Edwards.*

"*Stand fast in the faith.*" Because Christ has revealed God, the Christian is not only watching for a revelation to come, but also calm and strong by faith in the revelation given.—*Edwards.*

The point in question is undoubtedly faith in the atonement by the cross of Christ (chap. i.), and faith in the resurrection, with all its moral consequences (chap. xv.).—*Godet.*

Faith according to Paul admits of degrees, and of increase and decrease. And because the possibility of its diminution is not excluded, there is an ever-recurring need of admonition to the faithful to "stand fast in the faith," which, with such expressions as "Quit ye like men, be strong," evidently relates to the strengthening of the whole religious and moral life, and not merely to holding fast the assurance of justifying favour.—*Pfleiderer: Paulinism.*

"*Quit you like men.*" This and the next are two phrases which refer to the right mode of fighting; the former to *courage, energy*, the subjective disposition; the latter to real *force* due to Divine aid, the objective state. The former is opposed to cowardice, effeminacy; the latter to the weakness which may sometimes accompany courage. The Corinthians lacked energy when they accepted invitations to idolatrous feasts (compare Paul's conduct, ix. 27). They were wanting in spiritual power when they did nothing in the case of the incestuous person (chap. v.).—*Godet.*

SUGGESTIONS FOR TREATMENT.

I.

True Manhood.

By the Rev. Henry Allon, D.D.

What is a man? In most languages there are two words to designate the human creature; one, the designation of the species, the human race as distinguished from brutes; the other, the designation of distinctive character, the human creature true to the possibilities and responsibilities of his manhood. "Quit you like men;" literally, "Be men;" "realise the full possibilities of your manhood; be all and do all that your faculties and opportunities enable." We are to set before us an ideal of manly character and life, and practically to seek its realisation. Of the elements of true manhood, let us specify the following:—

1. *Integrity.* There are statesmen who tell us that morals have no place in politics. But the true statesman makes a conscience of politics. Again, there is perhaps a higher moral sentiment developing in business; yet one still hears of an undue advantage being taken of profiting by a man's ignorance or necessities, and that even by religious tradesmen.

2. Is not *purity* an essential of manhood? Some men boast of foul passions as the marks of manhood. It is effeminate to be pure. Initiation into vice is the baptism of manhood. But moral determination is altering that. A total abstainer is no longer jeered at.

3. Is not *religion* an element of manliness? I do not mean the religion of monks or of ecclesiastics, or of sentimentalists, but the religion of Jesus Christ, a reverent recognition of God, of holiness, of human life. Can anything be more noble than fidelity to the noblest things we know? Has the world any nobleness like the nobleness of holy character?

II.

"Quit you like Men."

By Professor Lewis Campbell, LL.D.

The enemy against whom the Corinthians are to stand fast is the spirit of party strife. The language is borrowed from the Old Testament. And just as the Apostle has here given a moral and spiritual meaning to an expression of old Jewish patriotism, so we may seek a still wider application of his words, and find a universal Christian import in his stirring trumpet-call.

One aspect of the Christian ideal is *moral strength.* "If we talk of strength, lo, He is strong." This aspect of Christ's character has a more general winning power than His meekness or charity. The Christian finds Christ's strength in his own weakness. So Paul, who was amongst his contemporaries in weakness and fear and in much trembling, is, to after ages, the great example of religious heroism.

One great secret of power is *singleness of aim.* Sir Isaac Newton differed from other men, he said,

in patience only. The single object of his life was ever before him, and preferred to all things else. The highest aim is "to do Thy will, O God;" which in different aspects is to do nothing against the truth, to serve and bless mankind.

The manliness which St. Paul enjoins is needed in personal character, in society, and in religion. First, *in the individual life* there is the weakness of self-indulgence, indolent habit; the infirmities of caprice, vanity, levity. Impatience is a sign of weakness: "God is a righteous judge, strong and patient." Faithfulness is a form of strength. Again, *in social life* the code is too often, "Do as others do," instead of "Do as we ought to do." One of the most insidious of social infirmities is the tendency to class prejudices. Herodotus tells us that the Medes of the fifth century, B.C., even after the loss of their empire, honoured, most of all, those nearest to themselves (themselves only excepted), then those once removed, and so on; "because they believe that they themselves are by far the best of all men, and those who live most remote from them the worst." Lastly, *in the religious impulses of our day* there is weakness; sentimental effusion instead of strenuous purpose; symbolism and sense-impression instead of rules of life; superstitions once rejected, now thoughtlessly revived. Thus the very citadel of the mind is yielded. Let us diligently seek the Lord; for "He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might He increaseth strength."

ILLUSTRATIONS.

If you think Christianity a feeble soft thing, ill-adapted to call out the manlier features of character, read here.—*F. W. Robertson.*

"Quit you like men," in the Greek it is one word: "*Be men.*" St. Paul here appeals to an instinct, and that instinct is *courage*. He tells his readers that in becoming Christians they do not cease to be men; that there is an instinct of manliness, and that Christ came to satisfy it.—*C. J. Vaughan.*

No man ever heard of the nation, of the society, of the heart, in which cowardice was honoured. Greeks and Romans had but one word for *courage* and *virtue*.—*C. J. Vaughan.*

Spiritual courage has two parts, a courage of enterprise and a courage of resistance. The Christian armoury has six arms of defence for one of attack.—*C. J. Vaughan.*

There are two kinds of courage—that of temperament, which does not see danger, or disregards it, like the lions; and that of reason and principle, which sees, measures, and meets the danger by calling up moral power—man's.—*John Ker: Thoughts for Heart and Life.*

A friend of President Lincoln having remonstrated with him against exposing himself by walking to and from the White House alone, Lincoln was a little nettled and showed it in his manner. Then he good-naturedly said, "Nevertheless, the fact is I am a great coward. I have moral courage enough, I think, but I am such a coward physically that if I were to shoulder again to go into action, I am dead sure that I should turn and run at the first fire,—I know I should."—*Noah Brooks: Scribner's Monthly.*

We reverence more, we ought to reverence more, the *grace* of courage than the gift.—*C. J. Vaughan.*

At the capture of Calcutta by Clive in 1757, the following incident occurred:—The approach to Calcutta was guarded by the fort of Budge-Budge, now spelt Baj-Baj. Clive prepared to storm the place. As the storming party was retiring to rest on the evening before the intended attack, a roar of acclamation was heard from the shore, and news was brought that Baj-Baj had been captured. It appeared that a drunken sailor named Strachan, having a cutlass in one hand and a pistol in the other, had scaled a breach single-handed, fired his pistol, and rushed on the Mohammedan sentinels with wild huzzas. Two or three other sailors heard the uproar, and followed their comrade with shouts and yells. The garrison fled in a panic. The storming party of soldiers burst in pell-mell, without order or discipline, and formed themselves in possession of the fort, with eighteen cannon and forty barrels of powder. Admiral Watson would have made Strachan a boatswain, but his habits were against him. It was afterwards discovered that his ambition was to be appointed cook on board one of the ships, but whether his ambition was satisfied is unknown to history.—*J. T. Wheeler: Short History of India.*

Courage lies midway between timidity and recklessness.—*C. J. Vaughan.*

In 1873 Mulligan's Hall was a basement saloon in Broome Street. It had been growing worse and worse, and one evening, hearing a disturbance, Captain Williams and the officer on that post went in. There were thirty-eight persons, men and women, of every colour and nationality, all of the worst character, and some notorious in crime. The captain took in the situation at a glance, and determined with a thought to arrest the whole party. Placing his back to the front door, he covered the back door with his revolver, and threatened death to the first person who moved. Then he sent the patrolman to the station for help, and for fifteen long minutes held that crowd of desperadoes at bay. They glared at him, squirmed and twisted in their places, scowled and grated clenched teeth, itched to get at their knives and tear him in pieces; but all the while the stern mouth of that revolver looked at them, and looked them out

of countenance, and the steady nerve behind it held sway over their brutal ferocity. It was a trial of nerve and endurance. Captain Williams stood the test, and saved his life. He wonders now why they did not shoot him a dozen times. Certainly it was not because they had any scruples, for the first two prisoners sent to the station killed officer Burns with a paving-stone before they had gone two blocks.—*Scribner's Monthly*, vol. xvi. : *The Police of New York.*

Let me follow still further the enumeration of the qualities which grow up in the preacher from his value for the human soul. Courage is one of its most necessary results. The truest way not to be afraid of the worst part of a man is to value and try to serve his better part. The patriot who really appreciates the valuable principles of his nation's life is he who most intrepidly rebukes the nation's faults. And Christ was all the more independent of men's whims because of His profound love for them and complete consecration to their needs. There come three stages in this matter: the first, a flippant superiority which despises the people and thinks of them as only made to take what the preacher chooses to give to them, and to minister to his support; the second, a servile sycophancy which watches all their fancies, and tries to blow whichever way their vane points; and the third, a deep respect which cares too earnestly for what the people are capable of being to let them anywhere fall short of it without a strong remonstrance. You have seen all three in the way in which parents treat their children. I could show you each of the three to-day in the relation of different preachers to their parishes. Believe me, the last is the only true independence, the only one that it is worth while to seek, or indeed that a man has any right to seek. An actor may encourage himself by despising or forgetting his audience, but a preacher must go elsewhere for courage. The more you prize the spiritual nature of your people, the more able you will be to oppose their whims. These must be the fountain of your independence.—*Phillips Brooks: Lectures on Preaching.*

When Goliath comes out and marches in boastful strides in the face of the armies of Israel, there ought always to be a David with sling and stone to meet him. Be strong and very courageous. Speak. Say that is not so; or that is not fair; or that is not kind nor generous; or that is a shame. It is soon done; or soon *not* done—and that for ever. A moment, and the uttered word makes you a hero in common life! A moment, and the word unuttered gives a triumph to sin, and leaves you little more than a coward's heart!—*A. Raleigh.*

"Stand but your ground, your ghostly foes will fly—
Hell trembles at a heaven-directed eye;
Choose rather to defend than to assail—
Self-confidence will in the conflict fail.
When you are challenged you may dangers meet—
True *courage* is a fixed, not sudden, heat;
Is always humble, lives in self-distrust,
And will itself into no danger thrust.
Devote yourself to God, and you will find
God fights the battles of a will resigned.
Love Jesus! love will no base fear endure—
Love Jesus! and of conquest rest secure."

Bishop Ken.

He addresses himself to women as well as to men; for in Christ Jesus "there is neither male nor female." Call it *courage*, and women will show it too.—*C. J. Vaughan.*

In the early persecutions tender women (*e.g.* Perpetua and Felicitas) suffered the most agonising tortures without a murmur—nay, actually glorying in what they had to endure for the sake of Christ.—*J. H. Burn.*

A wonderful illustration of the power of one person for the redemption of people from idolatry by the bold destruction of the idol, showing that the idol is powerless, was given in 1825 by Princess Kapiolani of the Hawaiian Islands. The goddess Pele was supposed to have her abode in the fiery abyss of the crater of that greatest of volcanoes, Kilauea, and her prophets denounced the most awful retribution on those who apostatised from her worship. But Kapiolani, in order to destroy the superstitious belief in the goddess, walked a hundred miles over the roughest ground and up the volcano's steep sides, against the entreaties of multitudes, and the warning of a prophetess of Pele. Reaching the top, she descended some hundreds of feet to the black ledge of the crater, amid some of the most terrible natural phenomena, a mass of molten lava upheaving and surging over the breadth of half a mile, through the agency of a mighty unseen power. There Kapiolani ate the berries consecrated to the goddess, and threw the seeds into the seething mass, and returned unharmed. This was a rare act of moral heroism.—*Anderson: The Sandwich Islands.*

What do we mean by *heroism* but just the power of subordinating self to the common welfare—thus losing the soul in order to save it?—*Samuel Cox.*

No one was more chivalrously respectful towards women, more tender to the weak and suffering, than Charles Kingsley. Yet that famous phrase, though he indeed repudiated it for himself, became inextricably attached to his name—muscular Christianity. It is but the Apostle's words in modern form. —*A. P. Stanley.*

Courage!

"Darkness before, all joy behind!
Yet keep thy courage, do not mind:
He soonest reads the lesson right
Who reads with back against the light!"

George Houghton: Scribner's Monthly.

Play the Man!

"It needeth courage to be true,
And stedfastly the right to do,
Loving him that wrongeth you—
Play the man!"

Walter C. Smith.

The Religious Literature of the Month.

BOOKS.

THE publishing season has closed earlier than usual this year, as many of the most important books are waiting the operation of the American Copyright Act, which comes in force in the beginning of July. But books come out in all weathers. And this month, though the number is small, of very good quality are two or three of those which have appeared.

MESSRS. MACMILLAN have published some recent discourses by the Bishop of Manchester—**The Teaching of Christ: its Condition, Secrets, and Results.** By the Right Rev. J. Moorhouse, Bishop of Manchester (London: Macmillan & Co., crown 8vo, 168 pp., 3s. net). The subject of the first discourse is, "The Nature and Limits of Inspiration," and of the second, "Limitations of Our Lord's Knowledge," and it needs no more to show that Dr. Moorhouse's message is for the present time. The others are less controversial, but not less practical, "The Master-thought of Christ's Teaching;" "Christ and His Surroundings—1. The Law; 2. The Kingdom; 3. The Unseen World;" and "Christ and the Social Revolution."

DR. MOORHOUSE has an interesting discussion, in the section "The Unseen World," upon the subject of "Demoniacal Possession." It has a probable reference to recent public utterances on that ever debated topic. The latest psychical experiments are familiar to Dr. Moorhouse, and he concludes: "In the light of such facts, I do not think that even Dr. Tylor's able and learned history of the crudities and cruelties of the belief in demoniacal possession among savage and semi-civilised races compels us to believe that Satanic influence is an impossibility." But he refers later to Martensen's theory, that primarily the Satan of Scripture is a principle and not a person, a spirit and a power which seeks to realise itself in persons, not unlike in its nature what we call the spirit of a tribe or a nation: "Surely this theory," he says, "illuminates for us, with welcome light, some of the obscurest sayings of our Divine Master."

THIS same subject—"Demoniacal Possession"—occupies the first half of a bold and independent volume of criticism which Messrs. BLACKWOOD have just issued—**Critical Studies in St. Luke's Gospel: its Demonology and Ebionitism.** By Colin Campbell, B.D., minister of the Parish of Dundee (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons, crown 8vo, 318 pp., 7s. 6d.). Its place is earlier than the Bishop of Manchester's book, as it is a criticism of the Gospel narratives which record the demoniacal cures. It is in every respect, except its excellent binding, such a monograph as issues from the German workshops any week; but its absolute indifference to the claims of traditional interpretation, its complete concentration upon its own immediate subject, are more rare in this country. Mr. Campbell seeks to show that St. Luke's Gospel reveals strong dualistic tendencies, first in the opposition of God and the spirits of good to Satan and the spirits of evil; and then in a condemnation of "the things of this world," as under the dominion of Satan, which passes into the austerity of Ebionitism. It is a book for scholars.

Pseudepigrapha: An Account of certain Apocryphal Sacred Writings of the Jews and Early Christians. By the Rev. William J. Deane, M.A., Rector of Ashen (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 8vo, 348 pp., 7s. 6d.). "Pseudepigrapha" is the title given to a species of writing which became very popular at or near the time of Christ. At that time the favourite book of the Old Testament amongst the Jews generally was Daniel. So Josephus tells us. And he tells us why. It was because Daniel did not merely predict the future as the other prophets did, but stated the exact time when these things should be. So the people liked Daniel, and they were ready to read more such definite prophecies if they could be found. The demand created the supply. But the obscure writers of these new Apocalypses thought to gain their writings a better hearing if they issued them under some honoured name, as Solomon, Enoch, Isaiah. The best known of these "pseudepigraphic" or "falsely-ascribed" writings is the Book of Enoch, which is quoted by St. Jude. Mr. Deane tells the romantic story of its loss in the Middle Ages, and of its recovery in Abyssinia in an Ethiopic translation by the traveller Bruce. He tells the history and the character of its neighbours also. They throw back a vivid light upon the Jewish mind in the days of our Lord. They themselves form a remarkable chapter in the history of religious belief.

Of the volumes of the Cambridge Bible, promised at the beginning of the season, the last has now appeared—**The Epistles to the Thessalonians,** with Introduction, Notes, and Map. By the Rev. G. G. Findlay, B.A., Professor of Biblical Languages in the Wesleyan College, Headingley. (Cambridge: At the University Press, crown 8vo, 183 pp., 2s.). It will stand the severest scrutiny, for no volume in this admirable series exhibits more careful work. And Mr. Findlay is a true expositor, who keeps in mind what he is expounding, and for whom he is expounding it. The Epistles to the Thessalonians are a searching test of a man's capacity, from the fact that it all seems so plain and simple already. The method of some has been to darken it first, and then endeavour to bring their own obscurity back to the light, as doctors shake their heads over simple cases, and then take credit for a miraculous cure. But that is *not* Mr. Findlay's way. He lets more light in where there is light already; and where it is dark, as in the great "Man of Sin" section, he shows us first where the darkness really is, and then does in some measure dispel it.

It would be a pleasure if we were able to say the same of **A Popular Argument for the Unity of Isaiah,** with an examination of the opinions of Canons Cheyne and Driver, Dr. Delitzsch, the Rev. G. A. Smith, and others. By John Kennedy, D.D., Honorary Professor, New College, London. (London: James Clarke & Co., crown 8vo, 196 pp., 2s. 6d.). To Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Kennedy's writings many of us owe much. So much that we know it is impossible that a new book of his can be devoid of merit. It is very far from being the case that "the Unity of Isaiah" is so. But, though much may be learned from it, though it may be right in its main argument, one cannot help seeing that Dr. Kennedy is not at home here. It needs more than this to prove or disprove. Even as a popular argument, it is of doubtful benefit. Yet the matter is one which can be made intelligible to ordinary church-going people, though not in this way, and we hope that Dr. Kennedy or some other will yet make it plain, leaving the truth to be its own victorious witness.

Order and Growth as involved in the Spiritual Constitution of Human Society. By the Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, M.A., Chaplain to the Queen (London: Macmillan & Co., crown 8vo, 141 pp., 3s. 6d.). "This book consists in the main of the Hulsean Lectures delivered at Cambridge in the year 1890." Socialism, the Church, Civil Order, Justice, Progress—these are the topics; and Mr. Davies believes the most valuable lectures are those on the Church and on Justice. His work is well known, for he has written several books already which have made their mark. This volume is worthy of those. Indeed, it is impossible that Mr. Davies should be unworthy of being heard when he speaks on the social problems of the day as he does here, for he has studied them, he is remarkably free from bias, and he writes well.

Professor Sayce thinks that the knowledge of medicine came to the Jews from Babylonia rather than from Egypt. At all events, the name of King Asa who "sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians" (2 Chron. xvi. 12), not only signifies "physician," but is of Aramaic origin, pointing to the fact that medical knowledge came to Judah from North-Eastern Asia. Dr. Sayce's articles in **The Sunday at Home** are full of instruction. They help us to see with the eyes, and almost feel with the heart of the men of the days of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

The Religious Tract Society has issued a handbook to Secularism—**The Secularist Programme.** By the Rev. W. Harris, Victoria Docks (London: The Religious Tract Society, crown 8vo, 64 pp., 8d.). It is within the reach of every one, and it may be most unreservedly commended.

Out of many average sermons let us choose one this week which seems quite above the average—**Blessing and Blest; or, The Work and the Wages of the Christian Worker.** By the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A., Findhorn (Inverness: Melven Brothers, crown 8vo, 14 pp.).

NOTABLE SERMONS AND EXPOSITIONS IN JUNE.

Gen. iv. (Spurgeon), Sword and Trowel.
xxiv. 63 (Pearse), Preacher's Magazine.
xlix. 10 (Sayce), American S.S. Times, 20.
Exod. iv. 2 (Greer), American Churchman, 2417.
Num. xxiv. 9 (Conrad), Treasury.
2 Sam. xix. 22 (Parker), Christian Commonwealth, 502.
2 Kings xii. 28 (Parker), Christian Commonwealth, 503.
1 Chron. xxix. 17, British Messenger.
Job vii. 12, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2206.
xxviii. 12 (Gregory), Wesleyan Methodist S.S. Magazine.
Ps. xxix. (Balgarnie), Theological Monthly.
xxxi. 15, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2205.
xl. 6-8, Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 2202.
lxxxiii. 3 (Jones), Quiver.
xc. 17 (Shuttleworth), Church Times, 1480.
cxi. and cxii. (Chambers), Homiletic Review.
cxvii. 25 (Cuff), Preacher's Magazine.
Eccles. ix. 4 (Burns), Quiver.
Hos. viii. 2 (Blyth), Family Churchman, 505.
Amos iii. 6 (Hankin), Churchman's Magazine.
Jonah iii. 2 (Vaughan), Primitive Methodist Magazine.
Matt. ix. 36 (Lang), Homiletic Review.
xiii. 13-15 (Voaden), Canadian Methodist Quarterly.
xv. 23 (Power), Quiver.
Mark x. 50 (Macmillan), Modern Church, 8.
xi. 22 (Miller), Footsteps of Truth.
Luke xi. 1-4 (Ryle), Home Words.
xiii. 23, 24 (Maggs), Sunday at Home.
xv. 17 (Gunsaulas), Christian World Pulpit, 1023.
xxiv. 17 (Carpenter), Sunday Magazine.
John vi. 52 (Thorold), Good Words.
vii. 14-18 (Baker), Christian Million, 399.
ix. 35 (Thorold), Good Words.
x. 22-24 (Holland), Family Churchman, 506.
xi. 33 (Maclaren), Freeman, 1896.
xii. 27 (Meyer), Christian, 1114.
Acts i. 9-11 (Bullock), Fireside Pictorial Magazine.
ii. 4 (Inglis), Theological Monthly.
v. 12, 15 (Bacchus), American Churchman, 2417.
Rom. iv. 16 (Raymond), Homiletic Review.
viii. 2 (Cumming), British Messenger.
1 Cor. xi. 1 (Stewart), Christian World Pulpit, 1022.
xi. 24 (Collingwood), Footsteps of Truth.
xiv. 8 (Ferguson), Christian Leader, 491.
xv. 6 (Maclaren), Homiletic Review.
2 Cor. iv. 1 (Boyd), Life and Work.
iv. 16-18 (Smith), Modern Church, 10.
v. 16 (Campbell), Homiletic Review.
xi. 28 (Clarke), New York Evangelist, 3190.
Gal. ii. 15, 16 (Deems), Treasury.
Eph. iv. 25, Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.
2 Tim. iv. 6-8 (Moulton), Methodist Recorder, 1745.
Titus iii. 3-7 (Rawstorne), Church of England Pulpit, 806.
Heb. i. 2 (Calderwood), Church of England Pulpit, 1022.
x. 24, 25 (Barry), Modern Church, 9.
xii. 29 (Holland), Church of England Pulpit, 804.
James i. 2 (Cox), Expositor.
iv. 4 (Roche), Treasury.
1 Pet. ii. 4, 5 (Paterson), Word and Work, 846.
1 John ii. 1, 2 (Moule), King's Own.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

With the increase in the circulation of The Expository Times we have endeavoured steadily to increase the contributions by distinguished scholars. But the result has been that the lighter features which characterised it at the first, and through which we believe it won its earliest success, have been more and more crushed out. In the enlarged series, to which we go forward in October, room will again be found for many of these early features, while we shall at the same time have freedom to secure the co-operation of able writers in larger measure than hitherto.

The issue for September will contain an account of the very full programme which it will be in our power to offer. Now we shall only speak of the Guild of Bible Study (of which the report for the current volume will be found on another page).

In October 1890, the Rev. J. Rawson Lumby, Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, wrote to the Editor as follows:—

"*I regard your proposal to concentrate the study of your Guild on limited portions of the Old and New Testament as likely to be extremely helpful. A little done well, gives power to advance; and new subjects are approached with more confidence. I earnestly hope the Guild may thrive and need larger space than at present in* The Expository Times."

What Dr. Rawson Lumby thus hoped for has taken place. It is to meet the demands of a thriving Guild more than for any other single reason that The Expository Times will be published in an enlarged form, beginning with the issue for October.

It is proposed that the Members of the Guild should study, with the aid of some Commentary, either the first twelve chapters of Isaiah, or the Epistle to the Hebrews, or both.

The results of this study may be sent to the Editor from month to month in the shape of Notes, exegetical, expository, or critical, or Notes of Sermons or Addresses, or short illustrative paragraphs. The best of these papers will be published every month in The Expository Times, and the writers, seeing them there, may send to the Publishers for the book they select out of a list which will be given.

Members may also test their progress at the end of the session by answering questions which will be found in The Expository Times for June. For the best answers, modern books of value will be given.

The Guild will now be more formally constituted through the enrolment of Members. The sole condition of membership will be the promise to study (that is, not merely to read, but to study with the aid of some reliable Commentary) the proposed portion of Scripture between the months of November and June.

This promise is not to be held in any respect binding should unforeseen circumstances prevent its being carried out.

Church dignitaries, Professors of Theology, and any person engaged upon the *study* of any other

portion of Scripture, will not be expected to make the promise, but will be enrolled as Honorary Members.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September, Professor Graetz of Breslau will reply to Dr. Swete's criticism of his theory as to the origin and date of the Septuagint.

Principal M'Clellan's article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May, "On the Rendering 'Daily Bread' in the Lord's Prayer," has attracted considerable attention, and, what is better, has led to some serious study. "It has given me two days' hard study, which, however, I do not regret," says one correspondent. Another very kindly sends Bishop Jebb's letter on the subject, from Foster's *Life*, and at the same time makes the interesting remark that in the three petitions of the first part of the prayer we have the Ruler, the kingdom, and the subjects; while the three petitions of the second part seem to refer to the present, the past, and the future needs of the petitioners. Jebb's letter is well worth reading still, notwithstanding its polemical references to "the justification man." It is the work of a sound scholar, and contains nothing which can be pronounced wrong even yet, fuller MS. evidence and textual study only going to confirm its positions.

The most important part of Bishop Jebb's letter, however, is its arrangement of the prayer, which is as follows. We give it exactly as it stands:—

I. ΠΑΤΕΡ ἡμων ὁ εν τοις ουρανοις,
Ἁγιασθητω το ονομα σου,
Ελθετω ἡ βασιλεια σου,
Γενηθητω το θελημα σου,
Ὡς εν ουρανῳ, και επι της γης.

II. Τον αρτον ἡμων τον επιουσιον,
Δος ἡμιν σημερον·
Και αφες ἡμιν τα οφειληματα τα ἡμων,
Ὡς και ἡμεις αφιεμεν τοις οφειλεταις ἡμων·
Και μη εισενεγκης ἡμας εις τον πειρασμον,
Αλλα ρυσαι ἡμας απο του πονηρου· Αμην.

The letter ends with a curious suggestion, which we must give in the Bishop's own words:—"I have yet one more observation, which, perhaps, is too trifling to be hazarded; and yet there may be, possibly, something in it. In the arrangement that I have offered above, the parallel lines uniformly terminate with the same letter; a technical nicety which our Lord might have seen it wise to descend to, both for the aid of memory and to secure the integrity of the prayer from subsequent mutilation or addition. Many poems of the Old Testament are acrostics, the lines beginning with the letters of the alphabet in regular succession. Why, then, might not a contrivance less palpable, but somewhat similar, be resorted to in the New Testament? That I may not be misunderstood, I shall add what, perhaps, is needless: the first and fifth lines end with the letter Σ; the second, third, and fourth with Υ; the sixth to the eleventh with Ν."

Again, from a leading article in the *Daily News* of May 22nd, 1891, we quote the following:—"The specimens in English show that the form, and even, to some extent, the substance of the great prayer, has varied at different periods of the language. In the text of it sent from Rome about 1150 by Pope Adrian, the Englishman, one part of the supplication runs—

> 'That holy bread that lasteth ay,
> Thou send to ous this ilke day.'

This is curious in its purely symbolical rendering of the petition for sustenance. Wickliffe, on the other hand, seems to stipulate, in the interest of a good appetite, that he is not to be fed with bread alone—'Geve to us this dai our breed over othir substance.'"

It will be observed that Pope Adrian's text approaches closely to Principal M'Clellan's rendering. We shall say nothing of the way in which the *Daily News* has misunderstood Wickliffe's rendering "over-othir-substance," which is simply a literal translation of the Latin *super-substantialem*.

What is a "seared" conscience? To sear is to dry up, and the adjective sear (spelt also sere) is almost appropriated for the dried-up leaves of autumn; whence sorrel, the diminutive of sear, the reddish-brown colour of the withered leaves. But the verb to sear, starting from the same point, early took a somewhat diverging direction, and signified to scorch—

> "I would to God that the inclusive verge
> Of golden metal, that must round my brow,
> Were red-hot steel, to *sear* me to the brain!"
>
> SHAKESPEARE, *Richard III.* iv. 1.

From scorching it is not far to cauterising, and the old writers on surgery use it so; whence Palsgrave, in his dictionary: "I sere with a hoote yron, as a smyth or cyrurgien doth. *Je brusle de fer chault.*" This is the sense in which the word still maintains a precarious foothold in the language. A seared conscience is a cauterised conscience—a callous, dulled, deadened conscience, a conscience that has, by neglect and abuse, gone past feeling and beyond appeal.

It is in this sense the phrase is understood in the single occurrence of it in the Bible—1 Tim. iv. 2, "Having their conscience seared with a hot iron." But there is a strong probability, as Professor Wolf points out in the *Homiletic Review* for June, that the meaning of St. Paul's word here is just the opposite of that. The phrase is simply "branded in their own conscience" (κεκαυτηριασμένων [or rather with Tisch., Treg., Westcott and Hort, κεκαυστηριασμένων] τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν). The verb used (cauteriazo), although the English *cauterise* is taken from it, does not mean to cauterise, but to mark with a *cauterion* (καυτήριον), or branding iron. "This cauterising," says Huther, "was done not only to slaves, that they might be easily distinguished, but it was also a mark of punishment, indicating the subject to be a criminal."

Accordingly, Dr. Wolf believes that the clear sense of the passage is, that as criminals bore upon their forehead the brand of their infamy, so the false teachers and seducers, against whom St. Paul gives warning, had stamped upon their conscience the sense of their sin. "So far from having become insensible to the sinfulness of their conduct, these heretics carry about with them the perpetual consciousness of sin. It is branded into their conscience with a red-hot iron. The evil they are doing by their false teaching they do in the face of their better knowledge. As the previous passage has it, they are 'speaking lies in hypocrisy.' Professing to teach divine truth, they are knowingly teaching error. They are acting against the unmistakable and ineffaceable self-reproach written upon their conscience with a burning pen. A similar party is spoken of in Titus iii. 11, as one who 'sinneth, being self-condemned.' The testimony of his own conscience glares upon his eyes like the brand upon a criminal."

In one of our earliest issues we had a note upon the use in Scripture of the words "Rock" and "Stone." This is the subject of one of Dr. Hopkins' "Unwritten Books" in the *Church Review* (N.Y.). He holds that the two words are employed with perfect precision, and in clear distinction throughout the Bible; "Rock" being used of God, or of Jesus Christ in His Divine nature, and "Stone" being applied to our Lord in reference to His human nature only. Thus, even when they come together in the sentence, "He shall be for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel" (Isa. viii. 14), Dr. Hopkins believes that the prophet separates the two, speaking first of the Messiah in His human nature, because the Jews were scandalised first by the things concerning His human nature—His poverty, His Galilean origin, His refusal to be made a king—and next of the Messiah in His Divine nature, because not till late in His earthly ministry were the Jews amazed at His Divine claims, and denounced Him for making Himself equal with God.

In the discussion of these words, the critical passage is the deliverance of our Lord to St. Peter, Matt. xvi. 18, "Thou art Peter (Greek, *Petros*), and on this rock (Greek, *petra*) I will build my Church." Says Dr. Hopkins: "There is a perfect harmony of all Holy Scripture, Old Testament as well as New, if we interpret the words, 'On this rock I will build my Church,' of the deity of Christ Himself, of which St. Peter had just made confession. If we interpret them of St. Peter, we go against the entire analogy of Holy Scripture, including St. Peter himself in his epistles. We apply a higher title to St. Peter, who on one occasion was a 'Satan,' than Holy Scripture gives even to the spotless human nature of Christ Himself!"

But is not the real crux of this passage in the words which follow, of which there can be no question that they refer directly to Peter himself, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven"? Dr. Hopkins holds that by proving the reference of "this rock" to be to Christ's deity, he has destroyed the foundation of the Romish claims. But if the Roman Catholic interpretation of the keys is to be left standing, it is doubtful if the basis of the claims has been very seriously shaken. This, however, does not enter into Dr. Hopkins' immediate purpose, and he does not touch that passage. But we may refer to an article of much greater power and elaboration than any of Dr. Hopkins' "Unwritten Books," an article in which the difficulty is keenly discerned and manfully grappled with. In the *Contemporary Review* for February, Principal Fairbairn, of Mansfield College, Oxford, writes on "Anglo-Catholicism and the Church." There he says that the only text which may seem to speak of peculiar official functions or offices as belonging to any of the Apostles is this saying to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." But he insists that the verse must be read in its connection. Peter had made his confession: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" on this rock, this truth confessed, His Church was to be built; and the confessor, the man who stood by this truth, preached it, obeyed it, was as such to have the keys. It was not an absolute promise to an official, or to a man who holds an office, made because he held it, and to his successors, for of succession or successors there is no word; but it is a promise to a person who has made a confession, because of the confession which he has made.

Dr. Fairbairn strengthens his argument by calling attention to the startling saying to St. Peter in the very next paragraph of St. Matthew's Gospel. Because he rebukes Christ for prophesying of His death, St. Peter receives the awful rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" The saying, like the very different one which precedes it, is appropriate to the moment; "neither is absolute, nor significant of a permanent character, or inalienable office, or indefeasible function; but each is through and through conditional and relevant to the context. Peter, so far forth as he would dissuade Christ from His supreme act of sacrifice, is Satan, an enemy and tempter; so far forth as he confesses the highest truth as to Christ, Christ has committed to him the keys of the kingdom. Both must be conditional, or both absolute; but it were hardly reasonable to conceive Peter as through all time filling the incompatible offices of Satan and the keeper of the keys."

The Office of the Ancient Jewish Priest.

By the Rev. William J. Adams, D.C.L., Rector of All Saints', Dorchester.

There are few subjects in connection with Divine Revelation on which greater confusion prevails in the minds of Christians than the nature of the Jewish and Christian Dispensations, the analogy and relation which exists between them, and the distinctive characteristics of each.

This confusion is not a harmless one. It is fraught with practical consequences which affect the religious life and standing of the believer. For by reason of this want of a clear conception of these two "administrations" or "ministries," many Christians are being led away backwards into Jewish principles and doctrines and practices.

This confusion centres in the Jewish priesthood. Here it culminates, and from thence it wends its way into almost every part of the Christian system. We propose therefore, in the present paper, to inquire into the nature of the office of the priest of the Old Dispensation; and, having ascertained what were *his* functions and their typical meaning, then in a subsequent paper to discuss their bearing upon the sacred ministry of the New Dispensation.

In the patriarchal age, and before the constitution of the Jewish economy at Mount Sinai, the father of the family was also the priest of the family. He only offered up the recognised sacrifices and conducted the religious worship of the household. Abundant instances illustrative of this will at once occur to the minds of our readers in the lives of the patriarchs.

At Sinai, however, the whole nation was consecrated to God, and every individual of that great family, now grown into a nation, was entitled to offer up the accustomed worship. The deed of consecration runs thus :—"Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my Covenant, then you shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a *kingdom of priests*, and an holy nation" (Exod. xix. 4–8).

Notwithstanding, however, this priestly rank and office thus conferred upon the whole nation, it was subsequently enjoined by the Divine Lawgiver that for order and convenience, and as in no way prejudicial to the priestly character of the people at large, that one tribe should be set apart for the performance of the sacred rites. Henceforth the people only *brought* their offerings. The selected tribe offered them up. The family of Aaron was appointed for this purpose and divided into two classes —Priests and Levites. The former offered up the sacrifices, the latter attended to the general service of the tabernacle and temple, and, generally speaking, held a subordinate position. Nevertheless, the Levites were an essential portion of the priesthood. Their ministrations are in various places dignified and referred to under the same expressions as are applied to the priests. Thus in Deut. xviii. 7, compared with verse 5, we read: "If a Levite come," etc.—"then *he* shall *minister* in the name of the Lord his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, which stand there before the Lord. For the Lord thy God has chosen him out of all thy tribes, to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons for ever."

It is however with the "priest," and not with the "Levite," that we are now concerned. The word translated priest, is in the Hebrew כֹּהֵן (cohen). In tracing the use of this word downward from the time when it was first employed, and conferred upon the family of Aaron, we are confronted by the remarkable fact that constantly, in the Old Testament, the word is not limited to the sons of Aaron. It is also given to individuals holding high offices in the State, and given to them by virtue of these offices. That this is the case is evident from the fact that the term is applied to those who were not of the tribe of Levi. They were therefore not qualified to act as sacrificing priests, and yet they are called "priests."

One or two instances will, because of their clear and unmistakable nature, be sufficient for our purpose. Thus, in 2 Samuel viii. 18, it is stated that the sons of *David* were כהנים (Cohanim), and yet they were of the tribe of Judah, "as to which tribe," as the writer to the Hebrews says, and we know, "Moses spake nothing concerning priests" (Hebrews vii. 14, Revised Version).

Again, in the same Book of Samuel (chap. xx. 26) we read: "And Ira also the Jairite was a *chief ruler* about David." Literally this is, "A cohen unto David." And, accordingly, this is properly rendered in the Revised Version was "priest unto David," and this is explained in the margin to mean "a chief minister."

Once more, in 1 Kings iv. 5, we read: "And Zabud the son of Nathan was *principal officer* and the king's friend." And this is rendered in the Revised Version correctly, "was *priest*"; and this, as in the former passage, is explained in the margin to mean "chief minister."

These passages prove conclusively that the term "cohen" does not, of and in itself, convey the idea and meaning of sacerdotal office and work. If it can be used, as we see it *is* used, both of civil officers and of members of the religious order, then the *essential idea* conveyed by it and belonging to it must be that of service and not of sacrifice.

Indeed, it is more than probable that the correct rendering of the Hebrew word כֹּהֵן is that of the margin, viz. "chief minister," and that this is the proper force of the word. And this interpretation of the term is authorised by Rabbi Jonah in his *Book of Hebrew Roots* (p. 310), where on this point he refers to the passages above quoted, and says that כֹּהֵן has the force of וזיר (vizier), namely "prime minister," the office having nothing whatever to do with sacrifice.

The term "cohen" then would seem to have been used indifferently both for secular and sacred offices, the idea underlying the word in both uses being that of *service*, and of a service which was *intermediary* between the governing power and the people. In its sacred use the governing power was God, and in its secular application the governing power was the king.

The sacrificial character of the "cohen" was not essential to his office but an accidental feature of it. It was not inherent in the word, or necessarily indicated by it. The term is applied to Melchizedek, of whom, notwithstanding, we read nothing as to his offering sacrifices. If he was a "priest," he was king and prophet too.

It is probably also in the sense of "chief minister," and not that of a sacrificing priest, that the term is used of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses. In Ex. ii. 16 he is called "priest of Midian," *i.e.* cohen. And that the signification of the term thus applied to Jethro was twofold, *i.e.* both *civil* and *religious*, appears from the fact that the Targum renders it כבא, "headman of Midian."

To sum up, then, we find that an examination of the original Hebrew word, which we translate "priest," leads us to the conclusion that the essen-

*

tial idea properly belonging to it is not that of sacrifice but of service, and that the service thus designated may be of a civil character as well as religious or sacred; and that, in general, a careful study of the Mosaic institutions leads us to the following conclusions: — That both priests and Levites appeared before God as the servants of the people, rendering *their* service; offering *for them their* sacrifices; acting as their representatives, and leading them in the public worship of God. In fact, their office was one of wide and varied duties, and by no means limited to the performance of a routine ritual. They were the appointed jurisconsults of the people. It was their province to adjudicate upon all controversies between man and man. They were bound to explain the law in cases of trespass or injury; to decide cases of conscience; to settle disputed points concerning rites and ceremonies; and, in short, to perform the office of judges and of teachers of religion. And it is to these high duties of his office that the prophet Malachi so pointedly and solemnly refers when he says (chap. ii. 7), "For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts."

After this survey of the comprehensive character of the office of the ancient Jewish priest we shall be prepared to take up in our next article, as we have already intimated, the relationship, if any, between it and the ministry of the New Testament.

Exposition of the First Epistle of St. John.

By Professor Richard Rothe, D.D.

CHAPTER II. 9–11.

"He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in the darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. But he that hateth his brother is in the darkness, and walketh in the darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because the darkness hath blinded his eyes."

Ver. 9. Up to this point John has not expressly mentioned the commandment of brotherly love; he could all the more readily take for granted that his readers would understand him, as they were well aware how in all his exhortations brotherly love was the Alpha and the Omega. If he presupposed on the part of his readers a knowledge of his gospel, he could be altogether without doubt in regard to this matter; for in connection with ver. 8 they must inevitably have recalled to mind John xiii. 34. He, therefore, now repeats the thought that the keeping of the commandments of Christ is the sure token of one's Christianity being real (ver. 3); he repeats it by substituting for the abstract notion of the commandment of Christ the more concrete notion of *brotherly love*. To be a Christian now appears to him as a "being in the light;" for he has just set forth the state of the Christian as one in which the darkness is passing away, and the true light already shining. Here *one's own brother* is not one's neighbour in general, but one's fellow-Christian. Here, seeing he is writing to Christians of their relation to one another (i. 7), he can from the nature of the case be speaking only of Christian brotherly love in the narrower sense (2 Pet. i. 7). The *hating* spoken of is not to be weakened into a mere "not loving," although there is an important truth in the idea that each lack of love is actual hate. Here, however, John, with a definite purpose in view, sets love and actual hatred over against one another,—they are opposed to one another as light and darkness, which also form a direct antithesis. Of the middle stages between the two, he does not speak at all here. Upon the basis of the position laid down here, such stages naturally judge themselves in accordance, namely, with their greater or less approximation to the one or other of the two mentioned poles. According to Paul also, hatred is the principal vice of the non-redeemed world (Rom. i. 29 ff.; Titus iii. 3; 2 Tim. iii. 2–4).

The state of being in the light absolutely involves brotherly love. Not only do we in the new light recognise brotherly love as a commandment that cannot be set aside, but that new light by its quickening brightness also awakens in us this brotherly love by an inner necessity. Its opposite—hatred of the brethren—is absolutely incompatible with living in that new Christian light. If the Christian hates his brother, he is still in the old darkness. John cannot conceive the light that has risen upon us in Christ otherwise than as a power awakening brotherly love in us. For that light is a ray of the eternal love of God, a ray that shines upon us in mercy; and therefore it must bring forth love in us. Moreover, it shows us our brother in a form in which he appears not only in need of our love, but also worthy of it. Hatred has essentially a

contracting and obscuring power. Inasmuch as it reflects our consciousness wholly upon ourselves, and, by referring everything to ourselves, unnaturally contracts it, it presents everything to us in an oblique light, and thereby closes our inner eye against the influx of the only true light, the idea of God. When the inmost source of light possessed by man's spiritual eye is thus obstructed, everything round about man is transformed into darkness. It is only as love that God can be understood; to hatred, however, love is absolutely incomprehensible. The measure of our brotherly love is, according to the Apostle, the measure of our true enlightenment. The keenest theoretical subtilty and the greatest intellectual culture are compatible with deep darkness in our inmost being; whereas, on the other hand, the eye of love is sensitive to all other illumination, and affords the firm basis upon which rests the knowledge of all divine and human mysteries. This enlightenment is not conditioned by the measure of one's intellectual culture; it can dwell in the simplest heart as well as in the most cultured spirit.

Ver. 10. There now follows the other side of the contrast. If a man loves his brother, the light (in Christ) does not merely shine transiently into his life; it is the abiding element of his life. He does not again fall out of the life in the light. In virtue of the brotherly love cherished by him, there are no effective hindrances and obstructions to his life in the light. Nor is there any occasion of stumbling in him:[1] he abides in the light, the occasions and inducements having, so far as he is concerned, ceased to exist, which could draw after them a falling out of the light. The occasion of stumbling thought of here is not that which is given to one's neighbour; for that would not fit in with the context. The contrast in which ver. 11 stands to the verse we are considering, compels us to think here of an occasion of stumbling which he who loves his brother does not *take*. John conceives the occasions of stumbling, which imperil the Christian life, as lying really in the Christian himself, not without him, in the world. If brotherly love is really living in him, by that very fact everything in himself has been removed that could make him stumble upon his path through life, the whole might, namely, of carnal self-seeking (i. 5–7). Pure, perfect brotherly love cannot have a downfall; for with the eye of its simplicity it easily finds a safe way, even through the thickest entanglements. It enlarges the inner eye, and thereby at the same time makes it keener. All duties are readily recognised by love, and they are not grievous to it. It has already overcome temptations before it has even became aware of them. This is specially true of the temptations which social life occasions in such abundance. For the relations of men to one another are undoubtedly involved; they are so, however, only in proportion as selfishness has sway over us. With self-denial those collisions cease to exist which add so much to the difficulties of man's life in society. Even in the sense (which we have rejected) of the occasion of stumbling which is *given*, the Apostle's statement is perfectly correct. True brotherly love gives no occasion of stumbling to one's neighbour; and the only way to avoid giving an occasion of stumbling is true love. Mere prudence will not suffice us. But if true love rules us, our walk can only be edifying to our neighbour, and we may devote ourselves to him entirely, without thereby running the risk of preparing an occasion of stumbling for him.

Ver. 11. The first half of this verse is a repetition of ver. 9. The Apostle repeats what he has already said, in order to obtain a basis for the contrast to the words, "there is none occasion of stumbling in him." The beginning of the verse is, therefore, only a way of linking on the words, "*he walketh in the darkness*," with which the train of thought resumes its progress. John means to give prominence to the danger that follows in the train of being in the darkness, a condition which exists wherever there is hatred of one's brother. He says, He who is in darkness *walketh* also in darkness. But woe to him that walks in darkness! He falls headlong, without anticipating it, into an abyss. *He knoweth not whither he goeth*, for darkness prevents one from knowing one's goal and direction. Destruction is certain; but the man who walks in the darkness does not see where it is, because the *darkness hath blinded his eyes*. "He has eyes, but they see nothing without light; in the darkness they are as if blind" (*vide* 2 Cor. iv. 4). He is not without an organ to perceive danger; but the efficiency of this organ is hampered by the element in which he stands, viz. by his ungodly, carnal, and egoistic life.

To walk in the darkness is a dreadful thought. No doubt there are some to whom such a walk is what they love most and find most convenient; but only men who are altogether ignoble can do so,—only those who attach no value to the fact that they are men. Whoever at all feels himself to be a man must find it intolerable to walk without knowing where and whither. Every one is in this case who hates his brother. He may, indeed, have correct ideas as to man's destiny in general; but he is in total darkness as to whither his own way is tending. He must avoid all sober-minded investigation of the subject from fear of being led to the most horrible prospects. The consequence

[1] Footnote by Dr. Mühlhäuser:—In a note added later to his manuscript, Rothe makes "in him" refer to the previous word "light": "In the light there is nothing upon which one could stumble, over which one could fall." This seemed to him a more definite contrast to the words, "he knoweth not whither he goeth," in ver. 11.

is a total blindness. If we vividly represent to ourselves the whole frightfulness of that thought, and are compelled to regard it as the inevitable consequence of hatred of one's brother, we must be greatly deterred from everything that is hatred. It is, however, unfortunately a daily experience that hatred has a blinding effect upon the human mind. It makes a man guilty of deeds of which he would have held himself to be altogether incapable. Nothing entangles one more completely in the power of the passions than hatred; and wherever only scope is given it, it ultimately leads inevitably to an abyss. Love, on the other hand, knows whither it goes; it seeks not its own, and can therefore easily abide upon the straight, divine way. Surrendering what is its own, it knows that it therewith gains the love of the brethren, and the love of the heavenly Father Himself. Perfect self-satisfaction in love of the brethren and of God is the goal towards which love surely tends.

Possible Zoroastrian Influences on the Religion of Israel.

By the Rev. Canon T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Oxford.

Part III.

(*c*) The preceding argument is of course only valid if, on independent grounds, chaps. lxv. and lxvi. be denied to the Second Isaiah. My view of the next passage, Dan. xii. 2, will hardly be disputed, the Maccabean date of the Book of Daniel being an accepted critical result. It runs thus: "And many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth (*i.e.* in Sheól) shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to disgrace and everlasting abhorrence." The "awaking" means the revival of the soul to earthly consciousness in a body. The "everlasting life" and "everlasting abhorrence" are the recompenses of the good and the bad respectively among the dead. It is not, however, a general resurrection which is meant; the writer is probably thinking, on the one hand, of faithful Israelites of the better time, especially those who have suffered martyrdom (*cf.* Rev. xx. 4), and, on the other, of base renegades who are raised from the dead that they may be put to open shame. To a great extent, then, this passage agrees with Isa. xxv. 8, xxvi. 19, taken together. It goes beyond them in its coinage of the new phrase "everlasting life"[1] ("everlasting death" is evidently avoided), and in its extension of the resurrection to the wicked. Is this latter feature merely derived by inference from Isa. lxvi. 24 (from which the rare word דֵּרָאוֹן is borrowed)? Scarcely, for the objects of perpetual abhorrence in that passage are (see ver. 16) partly Jews, partly Gentiles, but here (to judge from the context) exclusively Jews. Nor is it a fresh product of the Maccabean struggle, for (unless we are prepared to follow Olshausen in his view of the date of the psalms) open or virtual apostasy was not unknown before the Greek period. A form of the resurrection belief resembling that in Daniel may have existed long before, and why should we hesitate to suppose that the feature in question was suggested, not only by a natural craving for justice, but by its existence in Zoroastrianism? Surely the psychological and the historical explanation must be combined.

(*d*) Ps. xlix. 15, 16. The forty-ninth psalm is, one can hardly doubt, post-Exilic; it may be plausibly assigned to some part of the long reign of the second Artaxerxes (405–359 B.C.). Verses 15 and 16 are the central part of the *khîda*, the "dark speech," or, better, the "enigma," which the poet opens to the accompaniment of the harp (ver. 5). Can we re-read it in a Zoroastrian light? First of all, something must be said as to the form and contents of the verses. The text has been suspected of corruptness. One of the difficulties complained of is the abruptness of the transitions; this, however, is mitigated by transposing the words, "And the upright shall trample upon them at the dawn," to the end of the verse. Other difficulties spring from the peculiarity of the phraseology; but this hardly justifies us in altering the text; the poet has warned us that there is an "enigma" to be solved. Prof. Abbott, indeed, after Kamphausen, proposes to read in ver. 16, וַיִּרְזוּ בְמִשְׁרִים לַקֶּבֶר, but it seems to me that this can only mean, "and they shall go down gently to the grave," which is a description of a euthanasia (cf. Job xxi. 23), and unsuitable here. For my part, I adhere to the rendering, "And the upright shall trample upon them at the dawn," and I put this line at the end of ver. 15 (transposition is of course an allowable critical process), as the greatest and hardest utterance which the poet has to make. The other statements in these verses are simpler. They are (1) that the wicked remain in Sheól for ever, and never see (or for ever see not) the light, and (2) that the soul

[1] It is possible of course to explain חַיֵּי עוֹלָם "life of long duration" (*cf.* Enoch x. 9), where the phrase seems to mean "(at least) 500 years." This would agree with Isa. lxv. 20, but is in our present context most improbable.

of the righteous man shall be "set free," and be "taken from the hand of Sheól." The old Hebrew notion of the arrangement of the underworld was, like the old Greek, an aristocratic one. There was a secluded department of Sheól, where sceptred kings enjoyed a majestic repose (Isa. xiv. 9, Job iii. 14), and to this dignified resting-place selfish and tyrannical rich men in the age of the psalmist considered that, in a certain sense, their "glory" would "descend after them." For neither in the upper nor in the lower world could they brook the thought of judgment. "How should God know? is there knowledge in the Most High?" are the words assigned to them in one of those psalms which resemble most nearly the forty-ninth (Ps. lxxiii. 11).

Against this false theory the Psalmist, like two later writers in the Book of Enoch and the Psalms of Solomon (which are not so absolutely different from all the canonical psalms as Professor Kirkpatrick supposes),[1] utters a protest. "Far be it from thee," he would have said with the Yahvist of old (Gen. xviii. 25), "to do thus, to slay the righteous with the wicked, that so the righteous should be as the wicked; that be far from thee: shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" The Yahvist looked for a retribution in this life; this far more spiritually-minded post-Exilic writer (who speaks, not for the nation personified, but for each pious Israelite) in a higher life, which may conventionally be said to begin with death. But of what nature was this retribution? was it moral or material? Now, if we might, with Prof. Abbott, emend instead of transposing the second line of ver. 15 ("and the upright," etc.), it would be permissible to assume that the retribution was a purely moral one. For ver. 16 *b* ("from the hand of Sheól shall he take me") is certainly to be explained on the analogy of Ps. lxxiii. 24 *b*[2] ("and afterward thou will take me into glory"), the sense of which is clear from vers. 25 and 26—

Whom have I (to care for) in heaven?
And possessing thee I have pleasure in nothing upon earth.
Though my flesh and my heart should have wasted away,
God would be the rock of my heart and my portion for ever.

But if we are right in retaining that difficult line we must admit that, though a moral recompense (if at least, the word may be used) ranked first in the Psalmist's mind, yet there were times when he aspired, not from selfish considerations, after a lower, but not less necessary, compensation. Thinking of the sweetness of unimpeded communion with God, he was indifferent to the outward conditions of heaven itself. But when he looked earthwards, and realised the havoc wrought by sin in God's fair creation, he could not help longing for the removal, or even the destruction, of sinners (Ps. lxxiii. 27, 28; *cf.* civ. 31, 35). Of this general readjustment of circumstances the already current symbols were the resurrection and the renovation of the heavens and the earth. To the latter there is no allusion in this psalm, unless we can imagine one in ver. 20 *b*, "who shall never see the light." But a resurrection of the righteous is very possibly indeed referred to in those difficult words, which so evidently require something to be supplied mentally, "and the righteous shall trample upon them at dawn." The "dawn" is that of the resurrection-day when, as was already believed, "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," and the "trampling upon" the rich oppressors (*i.e.* upon their graves), who remain in their everlasting prison-house, is a sign of satisfied vengeance. At a later time, when the Scribes had developed all possible eschatological germs into an elaborate system, "dawn" became a figure for the opening of the new order of things called the "coming age."[3] Hence the Targum of Jerusalem on Ex. xii. 42 says that the fourth of the extraordinary nights is "when the end of the age shall be accomplished," and the Septuagint translator probably attached the same idea to the ἀντίλημψις ἑωθινή of the Greek title of Ps. xxii. But, long before this, the dawn was doubtless a Zoroastrian image. "Till the powerful dawn," says the faithful Mazda-worshipper, when waiting for each fresh day; "till the powerful *frashôkereti*" when longing for the everlasting light of the renewed earth and for the resurrection.[4]

I know that there are other possible explanations both of Ps. xlix. 15, 16, and of the other Psalm-passages referred to. It is probable there always were divine interpretations of them, and

[1] See my *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*, pp. 412, 413; Kirkpatrick, *Book of Psalms*, p. 37. Exegesis, I think, reveals the germs of the better Pharisaism in some of the canonical psalms, and so softens the transition from the pre-Maccabæan to the later Maccabæan type of piety. That there is a wide difference between the two Psalters, I do not of course deny; but this has not the critical bearing which Professor Kirkpatrick supposes. It is not chronological nearness which produces an affinity of tone and thought (contrast Jeremiah and Ezekiel), but belonging to the same intellectual stage or period. The difference between the two Psalters is wide, but not absolute, and can be fully explained. For the Maccabæan rising was a turning-point in the religious history of Israel. What a century that was between 142 and 50 B.C!

[2] Wellhausen, I know, would not grant this. He alters the text of ver. 24 *b* (see my *Lectures*, p. 430).

[3] R. Meir (second cent. A.D.) gave this interpretation of Ruth iii. 13: "Tarry this night here," *i.e.* in this world which is only night, "and in the morning," *i.e.* in the other world, which is only good, "if He will redeem thee; well, let Him redeem thee," *i.e.* God (*Midrash Ruth Rabba*, Par. iii.). Another statement is this: "R. Hiya Rabba and R. Simon ben Ḥalaftâ were one morning walking in the valley of Arbel, and they noticed the dawn darting its rays of light. R. Hiya said to his companion, Master, this represents to me the salvation of Israel; at first it is slightly perceptible, but it increases as it advances (Talm. Jer., *Berachoth*, c. 1).

[4] Darmesteter, *Ormazd et Ahriman*, p. 239.

that the liturgical poets anticipated and sanctioned this diversity. But the highest interpretation may, I think, considering the period to which the writers belonged, and the influences to which they were subject, reasonably be regarded as that which they themselves preferred. And, both for the idea of spiritual communion of God, begun in this life, but intensified after death, and for that of the resurrection (the two ideas need not always have been united), the Psalmists, and those who sympathised with them may, not to say must, have been indebted, to some extent at least, to the noble, though far from perfect, Zoroastrian Church.

(*e*) Ps. xvii. 15 :

> As for me, I shall behold Thy face in righteousness ;
> May I be satisfied, when I awake, with thy form.

Ps. xvii. is one of the most striking persecution-psalms of the late Persian age.[1] We cannot on that account say that it is bound to contain a reference to the new great hopes current in that period ; but we may, when two interpretations are equally possible, prefer the one which involves such a reference. The "awaking," then, spoken of in ver. 15, is not that from nightly sleep, but is of a transcendental order. בְּהָקִיץ, literally "at the awaking," may mean "when life's short *night* is past," or when the relative sleep of the intermediate state gives place to the intense vitality of a new phase of being. In the one case the higher immortality is the hope of those whom the Psalmist represents ; in the other, this combined with the resurrection. And if both the idea of the resurrection and that of immortality are equally characteristic of the Persian age, what object is there in resting satisfied with what is in one sense the lesser meaning? If, in Isa. xxvi. 19, Dan. xii. 2, "awaking" has the definite sense of rising again, what reason is there for giving it any vaguer meaning here? Notice, however, that there is no separating veil between heaven and earth. The risen man will, according to the Psalmist, see God as truly as if he were in heaven. "Face" and "form" are, of course, but symbols for the Divine glory. Need I add that this verse, especially if taken with the preceding one, is thoroughly Zoroastrian in spirit? (See *Yasna* xliii. 3, quoted in my first lecture.)

But here I come into conflict, to some extent, with the latest commentator on the Psalms, Professor Kirkpatrick of Cambridge. This conscientious scholar comments as follows on ver. 15 : "The words are commonly explained of awaking from the sleep of death to behold the face of God in the world beyond, and to be transfigured into His likeness. Death is no doubt spoken of as sleep (xiii. 3), and resurrection as awakening (Isa. xxvi. 19 ; Dan. xii. 2). But elsewhere the context makes the meaning unambiguous. Here, however, this meaning is excluded by the context. The Psalmist does not anticipate death, but prays to be delivered from it (vers. 8 ff)."[2] Professor Kirkpatrick's criticism upon the incomplete interpretation which he adduces, is partly justified. The Psalmist's words do not refer exclusively to the state of the soul after death. But he errs, I venture to think, in supposing that either here or in xvi. 9–11 "death fades from the Psalmist's view" altogether. Reading Psalms xvi. and xvii. as products of the late Persian period, when the higher Jewish religion had become conscious of its tendency, and been stimulated by the example of Zoroastrianism, and holding the opinion which I do on the data and the work of exegesis (see note 2, p. 227), I find it very difficult to assert that there is no reference at all to the bliss into which, according to the higher religion, the soul is introduced after death. Let us pass to Ps. xvi. The Psalmist prays thus : "Preserve me, thou God in whom I trust, to whom I am entirely devoted, and who art my sole happiness." The Divine answer is : "I will not abandon thee to thy murderous assailants, but will both prolong thy life, and sweeten it with proofs of my loving-kindness, and with the assurance of my nearness." Does the prayer seem to you sufficiently covered by the answer, from the point of view which we have adopted? For, after all, the peril of death must return, and, according to the traditional orthodoxy, "Who remembereth [God] in death, or can give [Him] thanks in the pit?" The deliverance, then, for which the Psalmist prays must be twofold : first, from the immediate peril of death, and, secondly, that from death itself absolutely and entirely. And, to judge from the lofty tone of vers. 5–8, he cares most for the second. The life for which he craves is that communion with God which, though begun in this life, can only be perfected in another. Death, to the nobler Psalmists, is not departure to dark Sheól, but an "assumption" to be with God (Ps. xlix. 16, lxxiii. 24). Such death cannot "fade from the Psalmist's view."

I know the objections that may be raised to this interpretation, and have already endeavoured to answer them in my *Bampton Lectures*. It may be said, for instance, that it presupposes a mysticism in the Psalmist, which is alien to the Jewish character. "For opposite reasons," says Professor Seth, "neither the Greek nor the Jewish mind lent itself to mysticism."[3] The answer is, first, to define mysticism rightly, and next to enlarge our view of the facts of Jewish literature. Another objection is that I have antedated the distinction between this life and the next—this and the coming age.

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 229.

[2] *The Book of Psalms*, vol. i. (Cambridge, 1891), p. 83.

[3] Kingsley.

There is some reason, however, to think that in this, as in many other respects, the evolution of Jewish thought has been continuous, and that, while elaborate logical theories were late, the germs, or rather some of the germs, of later theories can be traced, if not with clearness to the first, yet to the second, century of the Persian rule in Palestine. On this subject I cannot now dwell at length, but will ask you to remember the constant presence of Zoroastrian ideas in the neighbourhood of the Jews. The distinction in question was already familiar to Mazda-worshippers, and its adoption would be helped forward by the nascent consciousness of the Jews that "communities are for the divine sake of individual life, for the sake of the love and truth that is in each heart."[1] Could this love and truth be "as water spilt on the ground?" Must there not be a second stage of life? There was, however, no sharpness in the antithesis, because, according to a fundamental principle alike of the higher Zoroastrian and the higher Jewish religion, heaven is primarily not a place but a spiritual state. One point more and I will pass on. The reader will not be surprised that here, too, I suppose a diversity of interpretation to have existed from the first, and to have been anticipated and sanctioned by the writers of Ps. xvi. and xvii. I have stated which interpretation was, in my opinion, preferred by the psalmists, and mentioned a second less adequate, but still possible, one. There is also a third which I have indicated in my commentary. It was adopted by Theodore of Mopsuestia of old, and has found its ablest modern advocate in Rudolf Smend.[2] The view is that the speaker is the Church-nation personified. Modern minds find it difficult to take in the nationalistic interpretation of the Psalms; I have endeavoured in my *Bampton Lectures* to meet their difficulties. There is much in the Psalter which is primarily said of the true Israel. But since whatever is said of the Church-nation is applicable to each faithful Israelite, we must, I think, reject Smend's assertion of the exclusive reference of Ps. xvi. and xvii. to the nation. "A study of the spiritual atmosphere of the Psalmist's age leaves no doubt in my mind that Ps. xvi. 10, 11 [and still more Ps. xvii. 15] must have been appropriated without deduction by faithful Jews."[3]

(*f*), (*g*) Ps. xvi. 10, 11, lxxiii. 24–28 *a*. I have spoken almost enough already of these passages in explaining the two preceding ones. The Psalms in which they occur[4] are possibly as late as the beginning of the Greek period, when religious differences began to be more marked among the Jews. There is no reference in either to the resurrection. It would appear that, to most writers of this strong mystical bent, the hope of the higher immortality seemed more important (as it also certainly did to the early Zoroastrians) than that of the resurrection. Neither hope was as yet expressed in dogmatic form (the מְחַיֵּה הַמֵּתִים of the second Jewish Benediction is hardly pre-Maccabean), and, therefore, either might be selected by a religious writer in preference to the other. Without, therefore, denying the bare possibility that the writers of Ps. xvi. and lxxiii. presupposes the "sleep" and the "awaking," but leap over both in their eagerness for that which was to follow, I think it more probable that the soul, as they believed, passes directly from this world to the "Beatific Vision." It is a well-known fact that many of the later Jewish theologians did not postpone the sight of the face of God by the righteous till after the resurrection. We read, for instance, that "when the righteous depart out of the world, they mount upwards at once and stand on high."[5] And, what is more important for our present inquiry, the faithful worshipper of Mazda looked forward to direct communion with God before the great change of the world. Thus a famous passage of the Avesta says:—

"Gladly pass the souls of the righteous to the golden seat of Ahura Mazda, to the golden seat of the Amesha-Spentas, to Garô-nmâṇem (= the house of songs), the abode of Ahura Mazda, the abode of the Amesha-Spentas, the abode of all the other holy beings."[6]

This leads, of course, to the view that there are two judgments, a private and a general one, the first of which alone is really significant—a view which is clearly implied in the following sentence from Dr. John Wilson's sketch of the present Parsí religion (p. 339):—

"The resurrection, according to the notion of most of their community, is a resurrection not to judgment, which has long preceded it, and takes place at death, but to a deliverance from all suffering."[7]

[1] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xvii. 130.

[2] *Zeitschrift f.d. alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1888, P. 93–96. בְּהָקִיץ, "at the awaking," is very difficult on Smend's theory. He proposes to correct בְּהַקִּיצְךָ, "when thou awakest." God is said to "awake" to judgment in xxxv. 23, lxxiii. 20. But a reference to the judgment introduces a jarring note.

[3] *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*, p. 407.

[4] See my exegetical study of Ps. xvi. in *Expositor*, 1889 (2), pp. 210–224.

[5] *Tanchuma, Wayyikra*, 8, quoted by Weber, *System der Pal. Theologie*, p. 323. This reminds us of the Essenian belief, if we may follow Josephus (*War*, ii. 8. 11), that the souls of the righteous after death "rejoice and are borne upwards."

[6] *Vend.* xix. 32, cf. *Yasna* xxxii. 15 (*Oxford Zendavesta*, i. 214, iii. 65, 66).

[7] This is a purely controversial work, published at Bombay in 1843, but gives a good idea of that unreformed Parsí religion, which the modern reform-party are doing their best to transform (*see* Mr. Dadhabai Naoroji in the *The Religions*

Upon the expressions of the remaining passages of the Psalms I can afford to speak more briefly. They are so vague and poetical, and so little defined by the context, that it is only in the light of the preceding passages, and of the contemporary Zoroastrian belief, that they acquire a subsidiary importance. Those of (*h*) Ps. xxi. 5, (*i*) Ps. xlv. 3, (*k*) Ps. lxi. 7, (*l*) Ps. lxxii. 5, for instance, may easily be explained away as mere hyperboles. In my commentary I have ventured to plead for a deeper meaning, not, however, on the very dubious ground that the Psalms to which these verses belong are prophetic of "king Messiah" (see the Targum), but because they most probably represent an idealised form of the Semitic belief that kings, as semi-divine beings, have places assigned to them in heaven, which we find in Assyria and Babylonia.[1] That belief, in its unidealised form, may possibly have existed among the Jews before the Exile, for a pre-Exilic writer makes Bathsheba say to David, "Let my lord king David live for ever" (1 Kings i. 31). You may tell me that David, the "man after God's own heart," was precisely one of those kings for whom an exceptional escape from Sheól might naturally be assumed. But it should be observed that the author of the "family history" (2 Sam. ix.–xx.; 1 Kings i., ii.), from which Bathsheba's words are quoted, by no means represents David as a model of the virtues insisted upon in the Psalms. The idealising of this belief in the immortality of kings is, in fact, scarcely intelligible, except after the Return. Then it was that Israel as a nation awoke to the consciousness of the rights—the equal rights—of individuals, so that, in fact, to pray for the immortality of the king was tantamount to praying for the immortality of all worthy Israelites. Now, according to the view advocated in my *Bampton Lectures*, Ps. xxi., xlv., lxi., and lxxii., all refer to post-Exilic princes (viz. the first and the third probably to Simon the Maccabee, the second and the fourth to Ptolemy Philadelphus). May I not reasonably hold that the conditionalness of the immortality desired for the king in Ps. xlv. and lxxii. (where the evidence is very clear) is not wholly unconnected with the conditionalness of the immortality of Persian princes?[2]

(*m*) Ps. lxiii. 9, 10. Many of the earliest readers must have understood this in the same sense as Ps. lxxiii. 26, 27; and the Psalmist must have anticipated and very probably sanctioned this. (*n*) Ps. xi. 7 (*cf.* cxl. 14). (*o*) xli. 13 *b*. If two interpretations of the phraseology are equally possible, why should the Psalmist have preferred the weaker? (*p*) Ps. xxxvi. 10. Unless mythic phraseology had ceased to be intelligible to the later Jews, the Psalmist virtually says that the true function of life is not to be localised by mythic geography, but is with the righteous Jehovah (*comp.* 2 Macc. vii. 36). And why should not the deeply spiritual writer of Ps. xxxvi. 10 have referred, in the second line of this verse, to the crown of all joys—the nearer vision of God? Whether he looked for this boon immediately after death, or postponed it till after the resurrection, it is, of course, not for us to determine.

I trust that I have been able to show that the ideas of resurrection and the higher immortality may reasonably be traced in certain psalms and prophecies, on condition of our assigning these documents to the late[3] Persian period, when the direct and indirect influence of Zoroastrian ideas upon the Jews must have been so considerable. If I have succeeded in doing this, I have also proved that "advanced" biblical criticism has no inherent rationalistic bias. Certainly I am conscious of no such bias myself. My sole aim as a critic is to help in recovering the secrets of Jewish antiquity, which are often of so much importance for the right understanding of Christianity. These secrets may sometimes, it would seem, have been secrets only to the critics, having been preserved in the older exegetical tradition, though distorted by elements belonging properly to a different historical situation. I claim the goodwill, therefore, of church students of theology for the critical theories which I have on several recent occasions brought to their notice. At present they may seem to be, as this year's Bampton Lecturer has said in a well-known volume, speaking of the Psalter,

of the World, London, 1890). The sentence quoted above shows that on the point referred to the modern Parsís adhere to the belief of their ancestors; *comp.* the passage from *Vend.* xix. 27, 28, quoted in my *Bampton Lectures*, p. 399.

[1] I am aware that the interpretation of the Assyrian phrase, "land of the silver sky" (quoted in my book), has lately been questioned. But the belief in a heavenly mansion for royal personages cannot be argued away (see Tiglath-Pileser's Prison Inscription).

[2] In Ps. xxi. 6, xlv. 4 (*cf.* civ. 1, 31) the king is represented as endowed with divine glory. This regal reflection of divinity, of course, includes immortality. It is, in all respects, parallel to the *qarenô* of the Avesta, which de Harlez translates "la majesté royale," and explains as "une noblesse de nature jointe à un éclat de splendeur extérieure, qui appartient dans le ciel aux Yazatas et même aux justes. Sur la terre, elle a été conférée principalement à la race Aryaque, la race noble par excellence, et à ses rois. Mais à ces derniers, Ahura Mazda l'enlève lorsqu'ils abandonnent la voie de la justice" (*Avesta, traduit du texte Zend*, p. 200). Note here especially that the king only has this "majesty created by Mazda" as the representative of his race, and that even he may lose it. So Darmesteter remarks that this attribute is "the glory from above which makes the king an earthly god. He who possesses it, reigns; he who loses it, falls down" (*Oxford Zendavesta*, i., Introd. p. lxiii). Of course, the conception of the divine glory, reflected on human bearers, passed, both in Persia and in Palestine, through two phases, a physical and a moral.

[3] As far as I can see, it is not in the first but in the second Persian century that Zoroastrian influence made itself deeply felt among the Jews.

"very improbable and far-fetched;"[1] they are not, indeed, to be found in any of the German works which this helpful and considerate teacher has there mentioned. But the problems of the Hexateuch will not always monopolise the attention of critics, nor could I hold any of my esteemed opponents bound by their own words. For I have strong confidence, not indeed in my own or in any man's infallibility, but in the power of truth and in the effects of time.

It was this high doctrine of faith, which with quite youthful brightness the veteran critic Eduard Reuss[2] preached to me last summer in his country home in Elsass. He had himself experienced its truth, and learned to look forward rejoicingly to the constant expansion of our historical knowledge. He did not for his own part admit that the great ideas which I have mentioned were expressed or implied in the Psalter, but he has frankly told us in print that the psalms being nearly all of post-Exilic origin, he would not feel embarrassed ("ne nous gênerait pas") if they contained references to a future life.[3] Where there is such candour and such a genuinely historical spirit, it is impossible to be discouraged by an opposition which may prove to be merely temporary. Reuss was perfectly well aware that he was too old to change, but a deeper study of the criticism of the psalms and of Zoroastrianism may yet bring over such scholars as Hermann Schultz to my side; while from the numerous younger English scholars, who are either uncommitted or but half-committed to definite critical views, much may in course of time be hoped.

Such opposition as Schultz, and shall I add? Dr. Davidson, may give, will therefore not discourage me. It is much more trying to one's faith to read such an essay as appeared on this subject in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for October 1890. The author, M. Montet, of Geneva, was known to me by his writings in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions* as a bright and keenly interested student of the history of religions. Disputable as some of his statements in an earlier study[4] upon the same subject might be, my general impression was that he was a truly progressive scholar who would neither rest satisfied with the antiquated theories of the past, nor with a scepticism which would make any really valuable result impossible. In his later essay, however, M. Montet does not appear to have gone forward but backward, and I cannot help attributing this to a one-sided study of the works of M. de Harlez. If I am wrong, I trust that I shall be corrected. But the sentences in which M. Montet speaks of the Zoroastrian books and of the determination of the dates of their contents, and also of the age of the Mazdean belief in the resurrection, are in harmony with those of the learned canon of Louvain, but not with those of the leading workers, German, French, and English, in the field of Zoroastrian literature.[5] In his general results, M. Montet, if I do not misapprehend his meaning, has gone backward. In 1884 he, at any rate, held that the Jewish doctrine of the resurrection of the body was closely connected with, was in fact practically derived from, the Zoroastrian; in 1890 he maintains that it is "merely a different reading of the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul." Professor Grätz's treatment of the subject in a long note to the second part of the second volume of his history seems to me much more critical and satisfactory,[6] and I feel entitled to ask M. Montet for a revision of the judgments expressed in his second essay, which, able as it is, does not come up to the high standard which he has himself taught us to apply to his work.

There is much more that I should like to add; many more Zoroastrian parallels and contrasts to Jewish beliefs to which I would gladly refer. I have in fact but completed one section of the inquiry promised by my title. This is all, however, that my present opportunity permits. I will conclude with a wish that does not, I am sure, exceed the limits of Christian generosity. May these two great religions, committed to highly-gifted peoples which have survived equal misfortunes simply and entirely through their strong attachment to their Scriptures, find in my own time a more unreservedly historical, and therefore also at once a more just and a more sympathetic, appreciation from English students!

[1] *Lux Mundi* (latest preface).

[2] This honoured theologian was called to his rest April 15, 1891.

[3] *Le Psautier* (1875), p. 101.

[4] *Revue de l'hist. des religions*, 1884.

[5] See Darmesteter (*Oxford Zendavesta*, vol. i., Introd. p. xliii), with whom Spiegel, Goldner, and Mills agree.

[6] Prof. Grätz makes the Zoroastrian influence begin somewhat later than I have supposed. He makes, however, this important remark, which helps much to justify my own line of argument. "Iranian influence upon the Jews of Palestine can only (?) have been exercised through the medium of the Jews of Persia. These no doubt were surrounded by an Iranian atmosphere, and exposed to invasion by it. By the frequent intercourse of foreign and Palestinian Jews, Iranian elements can have found an entrance into Jerusalem, and been received with favour by those who gave the tone to society" (*Geschichte*, ii. 2, p. 418). He traces the doctrine of the resurrection to Zoroastrianism, and that of immortality to neo-Platonism. That neo-Platonism contributed greatly to strengthen the latter belief among those who came within the sphere of its influence, I do not of course wish to deny.

Our "Daily" Bread.

I.

By Rev. H. W. Horwill, M.A., Plymouth.

(*From the "Bible Christian Magazine" for June.*)

The Expository Times contains, with other articles of great value, a contribution by Principal M'Clellan to the solution of the standing difficulty in the interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. It is a startling fact, as he reminds us, that one clause in a prayer which has held such a prominent place in the worship of the Christian Church has been involved in more or less obscurity all along the centuries. It is around the word translated "daily" in our version that the controversy has raged. The late Bishop Lightfoot made an exhaustive study of the question in his book on the Revision of the New Testament. Mr. M'Clellan uses Lightfoot's investigations, and shows with much success that they lead to a conclusion at variance with that which Lightfoot himself sanctioned by the authority of his name.

The following seem to me to be the main results of research on this subject, which, though a problem for critical scholarship, is of more than academic interest. In the first place, it has been proved that the word *epiousion* is derived from *epienai*, and not from *epi* and *ousia*. This at once puts out of court such translations as "essential," "necessary for subsistence," "supersubstantial." Philology is so modern a science that there are scores of boys in English public schools to-day who know more of the derivation of the words used by the Greek and Latin Fathers, than the Fathers knew themselves. In this case, as in many others, the scholarship of to-day rejects without hesitation a false etymology, and therefore also the incorrect interpretation founded upon it.

Now the word "bread" is used in this prayer either literally or metaphorically. Let us assume for the moment that "give us this day our *epiousion* bread" refers to literal bread. One thing is clear from the derivation of the word, that it cannot mean "to-day's," but must mean "to-morrow's." The word *epiousa* or *epiousa hemera* is used four times in the New Testament. It is never used of "the day now beginning," but always of "the following day." This rendering is confirmed by our weightiest and earliest evidence among the versions. Jerome testifies that he found in the Aramaic vernacular, or the Gospel according to the Hebrews, a word which he translates into Latin by *crastinum*, "belonging to to-morrow." Jerome would not have written *crastinum* if he had meant *hodiernum*.

But if *epiousion* cannot mean "to-day's," can it mean "daily"? The general use of *epiousa* and Jerome's *crastinum* are equally against this rendering. The only evidence in its favour is the *quotidianum* of the Old Latin version, which, according to the admission of one of the Latin Fathers, was simply a guess. It might also be contended, though this is not a point on which I lay stress, that seeing that the adverb varies in the two Gospels ("this day" in Matthew, but "day by day" in Luke), it is strange that the adjective, if it bears a temporal meaning, does not vary with it.

If, then, the reference to literal bread is to be retained, we must be prepared to translate "give us this day our to-morrow's bread." Here we have reached a *reductio ad absurdum*, for the supposition that we are instructed to pray on Monday that we may receive the same day the bread that we shall not need until Tuesday may surely be dismissed as grotesque, especially in view of the teaching of the last verse of the same chapter. I may conclude the argument from language by asking why, if "to-day's" or "daily" was intended, it should be necessary to coin an entirely new word to express an idea that already had fit representatives in the vocabulary? Origen distinctly asserts that *epiousion* "is never even mentioned in any of the Greek philosophical writers, nor used in the everyday language of the common people, but seems to have been coined by the Evangelists." Why did the Evangelists deliberately reject words that would have simply and clearly expressed their meaning? It cannot be urged in this case, as in that of *eros* and *agape*, for instance, that the old words had to be abandoned because of evil associations that had corrupted them. Indeed, the ordinary Greek word for "daily" actually occurs in James ii. 15.

M'Clellan accordingly seeks in this mysterious word some spiritual meaning, which "could find in the tongues of the nations no adequate term for its exponent, and needed, as in Eucharistic symbol, some new vehicle for its tradition." He suggests that as "'to-day" in scriptural language metaphorically refers to the whole of this present life, "to-morrow" refers to the life to come, or what we sometimes call "the eternal morrow." He would, therefore, translate "our bread of the world to come," understanding it of a petition that the first-fruits of our future blessings may be tasted now.

Let us now consider this petition in relation to its context. Westcott and Hort call attention to the essentially metrical structure of the Lord's Prayer, "with its invocation, its first triplet of single clauses with one common burden expressed after

the third but implied after all, and its second triplet of double clauses variously antithetical in form and sense." It begins, then, with a triplet of petitions asking that in three particulars God's glory may be on earth as it is in heaven.

Our Father which art in Heaven,
Hallowed be Thy Name,
Come Thy Kingdom,
Done be Thy Will,
As in heaven, so on earth.

The second triplet contains petitions for certain mercies for God's children on earth.

If the whole prayer is now arranged in parallels it will be easy, I think, to judge which interpretation of *epiousion* best suits the context.

Hallowed be Thy name.	Our bread, the *epiousion*, give us to-day.
Come Thy Kingdom.	And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.
Done be Thy Will.	And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one.

In this context there seems to me something jarring in the supposition that Jesus Christ taught His disciples to seek, first, literal bread, and that He made this petition the most emphatic in the second series by putting the word "bread" in the forefront before its governing verb.

Further, is it not possible to see some connection in the clauses which I have arranged above in parallel columns? Let us begin with the third. If God's will is to be done on earth, as in heaven, it must be by our ceasing to do the will of Satan; that is to say, by our being spared unnecessary temptation, and delivered from the power of the evil one. In the second prayer, we ask that God's kingdom may come on earth as it has come in heaven. One emphatic note of the arrival of the kingdom of heaven is always the confession of sin and its forgiveness. The coming of the kingdom means in the fullest sense "the liberty of the glory of the children of God."

What contact, then, is there between the first pair of parallels? We pray that the Father's name may be hallowed on earth, as it is in heaven. One of the most important functions of fatherhood, or, as the Hebrews would put it, of the "name" of father, is the provision of food for the children. In heaven the angels glorify the "name" of Him who supplies them with the spiritual bread that maintains their celestial life. This "name" has been declared to us by Him who was the Bread of Life which came down from heaven. That the name of the Heavenly Father may be hallowed on earth, we His children must daily seek nourishment from the gift of the Holy Spirit, more readily bestowed than the bread which human fathers give to hungry children. This and this only is the bread that we need evermore. This is the bread of the life to come, of which we may taste even here and now.

Thus of the three petitions in the Lord's Prayer which are concerned with our own mercies, the second and third ask for the forgiveness of sin and deliverance from the grasp of Satan. But God has more than negative blessings for us, great though these may be. His glorious purpose concerning His people is not merely that they may escape from the bondage of Satan, but that they may be partakers of His holiness. In the forefront, then, of our requests for ourselves is a petition that, for the needs of each day as it comes, we may be strengthened by that Divine presence without which we shall indeed attain neither to the forgiveness of our sins nor to victory over temptation.

II.

By Rev. R. M. Spence, M.A., Arbuthnott.

Ἐπιούσιον.

"Bene est cui Deus obtulit
Parca, quod satis est, manu."
—*Hor. Carm.* iii. 16.

After having given much thought and study to Principal M'Clellan's valuable paper on "The Rendering 'Daily Bread' in the Lord's Prayer," I am convinced that the last word has not yet been spoken. Hoping that the important subject which Principal M'Clellan has started will be fully discussed in The Expository Times, and that, both as to the derivation and the meaning of the word in question, something approaching to certainty will be attained, I offer what I trust may be of some small service as a contribution towards the desired result.

I. Ἐπι—ούσιον, as derived from οὐσία.

I humbly think that Principal M'Clellan uses too strong language when, of this derivation, solely because of the non-elision of the ι in ἐπί, he says: "There is, of course, just the bare possibility that the word was *monstrously* formed by its unknown authors or introducers in ignorance or in violation of all Greek usage." Considering that this derivation is supported by such eminent names as those of Beza, Pfeiffer, Hackspanius, Mede, Toup, Schleusner, Matthaei, and Wahl, respect for their memory and undoubted scholarship should have restrained any one of our own day from using such language.

Since by universal consent περιούσιος is derived from οὐσία there was nothing "monstrous," however mistaken, in the belief that the derivation of ἐπιούσιος is the same. Nothing "monstrous," because of the well-known fact that elision is much more sparingly used by New Testament than by classical writers. True, instances of the non-elision of the ί in Ἐπί, in particular, are rare; still they do occur. I do not insist on words such as ἐπιεικής and ἐπιορκέω (common to the New Testament and the classical writers), where Bishop Lightfoot is probably right in believing the influence of the defunct digamma is felt. But in no classical writer should we find, as in Matt. xxi. 5, ἐπι ὄνον; or, as in Luke iii. 2, ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως.

Ἐπι—ούσιον is a *possible* form if the writer had any reason for emphasising the preposition. There was such reason, if we can believe with Hackspanius that ἐπι—ούσιος is sufficient, and περι—ούσιος more than sufficient. The writer having the contrast in his mind may have given the emphatic full form to ἐπί. Pfeiffer agrees with Hackspanius, both as to the derivation and the meaning of the word. He says that ἐπι—ούσιον is "quod substantiæ, *i.e.* naturæ hominis maxime est congruum et sufficiens.

Those critics have the strong support of the Peshito Syriac Version (quoted by Principal M'Clellan), of which Tremellius gives as the translation: "Da nobis panem necessitatis nostræ hodie;" while he renders the parallel passage in Luke, "Da nobis panem quo opus habemus quotidie."

In our own day we find the "American Committee" recording their desire that at Matt. vi. 11 the margin of the Revised Version should read, "Gr. our bread for the coming day, or our *needful* bread;" showing that some of their number preferred the reading ἐπι—ούσιον.

II. Ἐπ—ιούσιον, as derived from ἐπ—ιέναι through the participle ἐπ—ιών, ἐπ—ιοῦσα.

Among those who adopt this derivation of ἐπιούσιον is Bengel, whose comment on the passage I commend to the consideration of all. For what I now offer I am almost wholly indebted to him.

"Our bread," *quasi totum quiddam*, is our Father's gracious provision for our whole earthly life. Of this provision the distribution is from day to day. Both to the provision and the distribution ἐπιούσιον refers. We do not ask to-day for to-morrow's bread, which we could not do except in defiance of the precept, "Take no thought for the morrow." What we ask is this day's portion of the bread which has been and which, trust in our Father's gracious provision assures us, will be SUCCESSIVELY given from day to day while life lasts. "Our bread," *quasi totum quiddam*, is in the keeping of God. Of this bread we must not ask such a supply as while it lasted would, so to speak, make us independent of God. What we are bid ask is τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον, the SUCCESSIVE SUPPLY OF SUCCESSIVE NEED. As Bengel quaintly puts it, by the word ἐπιούσιον, "Denotatur *propagatio* indigentiæ nostræ et beneficentiæ Dei paternæ."

If this be the true sense of ἐπιούσιον, and (though, from the wish "audire alteram partem," I have fairly weighed what can be said for the derivation from οὐσία), I have a strong opinion that it is, then the English rendering "daily," though no translation, is not far astray from the essential meaning of the word. While apparently less allied in form, it is essentially far nearer to the original than our "morrow's" bread, or our "future" bread, either of which presents an instance of a literalness which misinterprets.

While wholly dissenting from Principal M'Clellan's conclusion, as a man believing what as a child the Shorter Catechism taught me to say, that in the fourth petition, which is, "Give us this day our daily bread," we pray that of God's free gift we may receive a *competent portion of the good things of this life*, and enjoy His blessing with them; I believe at the same time that no Christian can offer this request for things needful for the body without conjoining with it the soul's petition for the bread of life. They only who hunger for and are satisfied with it, can in honest truth make the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer the limit of their temporal wants.

Point and Illustration.

Œcolampadius.

By the Rev. Principal Moule, M.A.

I LOVE the name of that German reformer, Œcolampadius; it is only turning into Greek-Latin of the German *hauslicht* —house-light. So every Christian ought to be an Œcolampadius—a house-light in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God, as He expects of us.

The Commonplace Devil.

By George Macdonald, LL.D.

MOST people who deal with the figures in the New Testament make them to mean less because they are figures. That is the way the commonplace devil that possesses most men and women makes them treat all the high and holy things.

The Pharisees.

"*Primitive Methodism in the Yorkshire Wolds.*"

SOME boys were asked what they knew about the Pharisees. "They are a mean lot, sir," said one boy. "Why do you think so?" "Because some of them brought a penny to Christ once, and He took it in His hand, looked at it, and said, "Whose *subscription* is this?"

Evangelicalism.

By the Rev. James S. Stone, D.D.

The Church Review (*New York*).

EVANGELICALISM awake can do, and has done, wonders. Its keynote of personal religion begins a message that has been of glad tidings to countless myriads of our race. But evangelicalism asleep is of all sights most pitiable. It reminds one of a plucked lily—once the sweetest, it rapidly becomes one of the foulest of flowers. It does not make even a beautiful corpse.

Plagiarism.

By the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon.

ONE brother turned our sermons into Welsh, and then translated them back again into English, and so made them his own; who can find any fault with him?

The Seat of Authority.

By the Rev. T. G. Selby.

Methodist Times.

NOT long ago I asked twelve members of a class-meeting, "On what ground does your belief in Christianity rest?" The members were godly and of average intelligence, but not educated in the theological sense of the term, and the answer in every case was, "On the ground of personal experience." I asked a juvenile class last night the same question, and the answer I got in every case was, "The Bible." The difference in the answer is suggestive. With growing religious life and experience, whilst not forgetting our obligation to the very phraseology of the Scriptures, we have less need to rest on the authority arising from some particular theory of inspiration. Its principles will be inwardly verified. We meet with tourists sometimes who pore over the guide-book in a picture gallery or on a mountain summit when they should be using their eyes in other ways. And the same type of person exists in the Church.

The Great Cobden.

The English Illustrated Magazine.

AMONG the best fast bowlers ever at Harrow, was F. C. Cobden, who, when at Cambridge, bowled the last three wickets of the Oxford eleven in three consecutive balls, and thus won the match. A smaller Harrow boy being asked by his father whether he was any relation to the great Cobden, replied indignantly, "*He is the great Cobden.*"

Cain.

By William H. Hayne.

The Atlantic Monthly.

A SOMBRE brow, whose dark-veined furrows bear
Remorseful fruit from God's curse planted there,—
Uplifted hands o'er eyes that look though time
Big with the burden of unshriven crime.

The Expository Times Guild of Bible Study.

REPORT UPON EXAMINATION PAPERS.

1. Paper set by Professor Dods—
   The Rev. Martin J. Birks, Elland, Yorkshire.
   Mr. Edward Creaney, Principal of William Street School, Newry.
2. Paper set by Professor Marshall—
   The Rev. L. L. Barclay, B.A., Morton, Gainsborough.
3. Paper set by Principal Moule—
   The Rev. J. Armitt, Macclesfield.
   The Rev. W. Matthews, Mossley, Manchester.
4. Paper set by Professor Agar Beet—
   The Rev. Alfred Gill, Farringdon, Exeter.

If the above will let the publishers know their choice of the following volumes, they will be sent at once. Nos. 1 and 3 may choose one volume, Nos. 2 and 4 may choose two.

Christlieb's *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief.*
Delitzsch on *The Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes.*
Döllinger's *Hippolytus and Callistus.*
Ewald's *Revelation: Its Nature and Record.*
Frank's *System of Christian Certainty.*
Goebel's *The Parables of Jesus.*
Hengstenberg's *Commentary on Ezekiel.*
Orelli on *The Prophecies of Isaiah.*
Winer on *The Confessions of Christendom.*
Stier's *Words of the Risen Saviour.*
Steinmeyer's *History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord.*
Sartorius on *The Doctrine of Divine Love.*
St. Augustine on *The Trinity.*
Meyer on *Philippians and Colossians.*
Monrad's *The World of Prayer.*
Rothe's *Sermons for the Christian Year.*
Beck's *Pastoral Theology.*

Full particulars of those books will be found in Messrs. Clark's catalogue, to be had post free on application (38 George Street, Edinburgh).

Recent Literature on the Writings of St. John.

SUPPLEMENT.

Note.—The first five volumes have been published since the survey of last month was printed. Mr. Gibbon's volume might have been included in that survey.

1. *The Expositor's Bible. The Gospel of St. John.* By Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. In two volumes, Vol I. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Cr. 8vo, pp. xvi, 388. 1891, 7s. 6d.
2. *The Biblical Illustrator.* By Rev. Joseph S. Exell, M.A. *St. John*, Vol. II. London: James Nisbet & Co. 8vo, pp. 687. 1891, 7s. 6d.
3. *The Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools. The Gospel according to St. John, with Map, Introduction, and Notes.* By the Rev. A. Plummer, M.A., Master of University College, Durham. Cambridge: At the University Press. Small 8vo, pp. 160. 1891, 1s.
4. *The General Epistles of SS. James, Peter, John, and Jude, with Notes, critical and practical.* By the Rev. M. F. Sadler, Prebendary of Wells. London: George Bell & Sons. Cr. 8vo, pp. xl, 305. 1891, 6s.
5. *First Epistle General of St. John: Notes of Lectures to serve as a Popular Commentary.* By the Rev. Charles Watson, D.D., Largs. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons. Cr. 8vo, pp. 534. 1891, 7s. 6d.
6. *Eternal Life: Notes of Expository Sermons on the Epistles of St. John.* Preached at Stamford Hill Congregational Church, 1889–1890. By Rev. J. M. Gibbon. London: R. D. Dickinson. Cr. 8vo, pp. 203. 1890.

The editor of the Expositor's Bible has perceptibly raised the rank of the expository discourse, and this volume by Professor Dods will maintain it at its highest. It does not demand exhaustive analysis. This is the work for which Dr. Dods is prepared, and he always gives himself to it.

This volume of the *Biblical Illustrator* carries us from chapter viii. to chapter xv. of St. John's Gospel, so that there still remains one volume. When it appears, we shall have the biggest quarry and the best for this gospel that modern times have produced.

The Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools might have been called the Pocket Commentary for all. It is "a box where sweets compacted lie." And not schools only but many private persons who have long since left the forms and the standards will find these little books instructive. Dr. Plummer's St. John is a miracle of judicious compression.

Prebendary Sadler has also the gift of compression (though he does not require to exercise it here so rigidly as Dr. Plummer), and he is able to furnish within this small volume a sufficiently full exposition of the whole of the Epistles of SS. James, Peter, John, and Jude, together with a workmanlike introduction to each of them. His purpose is practical, and the application is never lost sight of; but it is not often, if ever, allowed to draw the exposition after it. The writer has his own standpoint of course, which tells here and there. The critical notes are brief, but there is a candid and instructive note of considerable length on the three witnesses (1 John v. 8). When this volume is followed by the Apocalypse, which we hope speedily to see, Mr. Sadler will have furnished a complete Commentary on the New Testament, and erected an enduring monument to his own industry and spiritual ability.

In the expository discourse two things have to be considered—the exposition and the discourse. The former may be perfectly correct while the latter is altogether commonplace; the latter may be highly eloquent while the former is utterly worthless. Forty years ago, Dr. Watson tells us, these discourses were first delivered, and since then they have been twice re-written and preached. We therefore look forward to find that the exposition will be worthy, whatever the discourse may be. And so it is. Dr. Watson has, with most unusual self-discipline, confined himself to the words and thoughts not merely of the apostle but of the epistle. "There is much in the First Epistle of St. John which no man, apart from apostolic authority, could venture to say, and much left out of it which an apostle might have been expected to enforce. In writing upon it, therefore, the limits of this teaching must be strictly observed, and nothing given more or less than that which seems to be the meaning and force of the words of St. John." Such an aim, strenuously kept in view, almost marks a new departure in exposition. It deserves the highest commendation. But, further, as to the discourses. Is it unfair to wish that we had seen the first writing or heard the first delivery of them? The language here is chaste and forcible, the arrows are carefully polished, but we miss the sudden home-thrust that often finds its mark most surely and carries the deepest conviction.

Mr. Gibbon has not described his work either as a commentary or as an exposition, for it is neither. "Notes of Expositions" is the correct title. Most men would have counted the discourses themselves good enough to print in full, but this is better than the full discourse. They are not disjointed reflections however, sentences with their heads removed or their tails cut off. Nor are they skeleton sermons, all head and tail together. The short sections into which the work is divided may be recommended as admirable for family reading, for you have the Word itself and the exposition with it, and all most readable and instructive.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 Cor. xiv. 20.

"Brethren, be not children in mind: howbeit in malice be ye babes, but in mind be men" (R.V.).

Exposition.

"*Brethren.*" This address is fitted to bring them back to the feeling of Christian dignity which had been singularly weakened in them.—*Godet.*

There is a tone of gentleness in the address as well as of censure.—*Ellicott.*

"*Be not children.*"—*Become not* (γίνεσθε), not so harsh as *be not.* They *were* childish; but he only urges them not to *become* such.—*Edwards.*

They were becoming childish, inasmuch as, through their increasing craving after glossolalia, they lacked more and more the power of distinguishing and judging between the useful and the useless.—*Meyer.*

"*Babes.*" There are three grades spoken of in the original — infants, children, full-grown men. Their conduct in exalting these "tongues" is a proof that they are yet children in knowledge; they ought to be full-grown. The only thing in which they ought to be children is evil, and in that they cannot be too young, too inexperienced; they should be merely infants.—*Shore.*

"*Men.*" Literally *perfect, i.e.* of ripe age. Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 6, Phil. iii. 15, Heb. v. 14.—*Lias.*

Methods of Treatment.

I.

The Manliness of the Gospel.

By the Very Rev. C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Dean of Llandaff.

St. Paul is speaking of divine gifts, and yet he says that there may be a childishness in the use of them. It is not enough to be able to plead that the thing for which you are fighting is true. The gift of tongues was a real and a supernatural sign. St. Paul knew and felt it to be so; yet he counts it no irreverence to put it in its place. He does not consider either himself or his readers precluded from estimating, from comparing, or from controlling it. He boldly declares even spiritual influences, even divine operations, to be subordinate, in the person acted upon, to considerations of propriety, of expediency, of common sense. He assumes that the Holy Spirit of God is working, and yet he says that these inspirations themselves are subject to the man inspired with them. The influence of God Himself, even in a miraculous form, is not a compulsion—it is a suggestion; and God expects that His superadded gift, of tongues or of prophecy, shall be brought to the bar of His original gift to the same person, of conscience and judgment, of reason and will.

There are two classes of subjects upon the treatment of which St. Paul throws a guiding and comforting light in the weighty maxim before us—Doctrine and Duty.

1. Revelation is above reason, since God would not reveal what intellect could discover. But only when the divine origin of a revelation is attested (as alone it can be) by evidences of its being worthy of the divine Author in all these features of holiness, wisdom, power, and love, which together form, to our instinct, the very idea and definition of God, only then does it speak on each point which it touches with authority. Again, revelation passes through human hands in its transmission. The correctness of that transmission is, in each particular, a question for the understanding. Then there remains the weightiest matter of all, which is the interpretation of doctrine by the comparison of Scripture with Scripture. Many and varying views may be taken of a text, of the genuineness of which there is no doubt; and though we all feel that only the Spirit, given in answer to prayer, can feed the soul out of it, or even satisfy the devout mind as to its interpretation; yet instrumentally, even here, that mind must be employed, if satisfaction, if edification is to come to the student.

2. Apply the precept now to practical duty. Sin makes great havoc of human happiness—nothing else can compete with it. But next to it, with however long an interval, stands folly. See its operation in the methods taken by many parents to educate their children, or in the actions of our own past lives. How large is the action of unintelligent childishness inside the Church. All that subjects my conscience to another man's rule is a repudiation of St. Paul's "Be men." How unmanly, how childish are half the biographies, diaries, devotions of Christian saints.

II.

Christian Manhood.

By the Rev. Professor B. Jowett, D.D.

True and appropriate as it is in some respects, there are other respects in which the image of childhood fails to convey the true idea of human beings in this world. The child has no experience, whereas to the grown-up man experience is the great teacher. In religion no man dare disregard its teaching. The earnest desire to do right is the great safeguard; but we seem to require something more than this, the knowledge of our own characters, of our strength, of our weakness, of the power of circumstances, and the force of the sin that doth so easily beset us, and of the deceptions and delusions to which we are liable.

One of the latest fruits of experience in the paths of life is moderation; that calm and ignoble temper which sees things in their true proportions, when the heat of passion has subsided, and the movement we had expected was to have regenerated the world is exhausted. Happy is he who, having that moderation, can still maintain his enthusiasm.

Lastly, though there are many other points of character, we should be men in our firmness and strength of purpose. Many grown-up persons are like young children; they do as others do; they have no thought or principle of their own; they take the epidemic that happens to be in the air. But the greater part of the good which is done in the world is done by those who dare to be themselves.

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

"Did it ever strike you that St. Paul was mad?" was a question asked me in conversation, not by a scoffer but by a man of powerful intellect, who felt that the question between Christianity and unbelief turned upon the case of that man who from being "a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious" was changed into "a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles." We commend to the honest inquirer, in reference to this important question,—the sanity of St. Paul,—the study of this one chapter which contains the words of the text.—*C. J. Vaughan.*

By being "men in understanding" the apostle does not refer exclusively to largeness of *knowledge*,—the expansion and development of the intellectual faculty,—but in connection with this, including it, or including it in some degree, he refers to that moral development of both mind and heart, that maturity of the inward man, which consists of deep and just views of truth and duty, in sobriety, earnestness, unselfishness, fidelity to conscience, brotherly love, with every other virtue which marks the condition of the "perfectly" and properly developed soul.—*Thomas Binney.*

The devotion which has ignorance for its mother, and the zeal which parts company with charity, and the theology which is logical at the expense of common sense, and such faith as finds it easiest to believe what is against, not above, reason,—these are the types of theology, faith, zeal, and devoutness which have in most ages of Christianity commanded the adhesion of the greater part of Christians.—*J. Oswald Dykes.*

It is childish to dip into the pages of the Bible with a pin, as if it were a book of fate; it is hardly less childish to cite texts at random, out of their connection, without asking when they were written, or with what design. Scripture texts, if you use them unintelligently, are as dangerous data to reason from as statistics.—*J. Oswald Dykes.*

There is a childish jealousy of trifles as well as a childish love for them.—*J. Oswald Dykes.*

It were going a great deal too far to say that they who were men in understanding were, therefore, likely to be children in malice. But the converse holds good with remarkable certainty, that they who are children in understanding are proportionably apt to be men in malice, that is, in proportion as men neglect that which should be the guide of their lives, so are they left to the mastery of their passions.—*T. Arnold.*

After all, however, it is worth while to recall that the understanding holds the function in the Christian life of a regulator or check, nowise that of a moving power.—*J. Oswald Dykes.*

The Hire of the Labourers in the Vineyard.

By the Rev. Charles Connor, Old Meldrum.

The main purpose of this parable is, undoubtedly, to contrast the bargaining spirit of the world with the trustful service required by the gospel of the Christian. The labourers that enter the vineyard at sunrise make an *agreement* for a certain wage, while the others enter on their work in trust, that "whatsoever is right" they shall receive. And the scene at sundown is to show that, as the bargaining spirit is lower in principle, so also is it poorer in results. The reward assigned to those that have laboured only one cool hour, but laboured trustfully, is equal to the whole day's wage paid to those that had made their contract sure.

We have but one group of labourers to represent the bargaining spirit, but four to illustrate the spirit of trustful service. In its opening scenes the parable dwells on the calling of those who, at successive periods of the day, entered the vineyard late. We are carefully given to understand the exact length of time during which they wrought. When we come to the reckoning, however, in the end of the day, the three intermediate groups—all of the trustful order, let it be observed—almost disappear from the story. The labourers come in due order to receive their hire, but the parable concerns itself now with only the last and the first. But what of the others? Is their place in the parable meaningless? It must be shown that what is told us concerning them sharpens the grand contrast between the first and the last, and contributes essentially to the right understanding of the Master's procedure in the end.

"It may," says Trench, "be securely inferred that all between the last and the first received the penny as well."

Certainly this "inference" has been invariably drawn. Many are probably not aware that, at the best, it is nothing better than an inference, and will be surprised to find that the parable does not affirm this. We are at a loss to know on what grounds, as an inference, it rests. If we are told that an employer gives as much to a man that works one hour trustfully, as he pays to another that works a whole day by an agreement, we may surely infer that for three hours of trustful labour he will give three times as much. That all the labourers received the same remuneration is, in fact, not an inference, but an assumption. We hold that it ruins the symmetry of the parable, and in itself is neither reasonable nor right.

We shall endeavour to show clear grounds for inferring, on the contrary, that *the hire of the trustful labourers must be conceived of as rising according to the duration of their toil, and on the generous scale of remuneration instanced in the case of those that had laboured for only a single hour.* The arithmetic is Simple Proportion. The Householder's estimate of the worth of labour is represented as twelve times higher than the standard fixed by the labour market. We do not, of course, attach any importance to this, except as belonging to the form of the story. (Compare Matt. xix. 29, "Shall receive an *hundredfold*.") The generosity of Heaven's estimate will far exceed any computation of ours. The inner truth of the parable is, that the least possible amount of work done trustfully will meet with as high a recompense as larger efforts made in a different spirit. But the right understanding of the structure of the parable, as our Lord relates it, is what concerns us now.

The view which thus far we have been stating, we now proceed to prove.

1. In the first place, *it is implied in the logic of the parable itself.* Of the four groups of workmen that entered the vineyard late, but trustfully, the last is selected as making the contrast the most striking, and because the parable had undertaken to deal with extreme cases (chap. xix. 30). It was not our Lord's purpose to institute any direct comparison between these different groups of trustful labourers. But the argument of the parable requires us to conceive of these eleventh-hour labourers as representing the principle of trustfulness when its claims are at their weakest; and this presupposes that the claims of the others are acknowledged to be greater. The underlying argument is *a fortiori.* The story asserts an equality of reward, not between the bargaining and the trustful, but between those that had made the most of their bargain, and those that could make least by their trustfulness. It does not commend a trustful spirit to say, or to imply, that the man who works nine hours is, after all, only on an equality with him that works for one. But it is a great commendation of faith, that he who labours trustfully for a single hour is as richly rewarded as the man that labours twelve, by the best agreement he can make. For happy are they that have wrought in faith for longer periods. How abundant in results must be a long day's trustful toil.

2. *With this view agrees also the context of the foregoing chapter.* The rich young man had come (chap. xix. 16) seeking to strike a bargain with Christ for Eternal Life. Then Peter's question, arising out of this incident (chap. xix. 27) displayed, on the surface of it at least, something of the same spirit; and Christ, recognising the better spirit of the man, assured His disciples (chap. xix. 29) that there were abundant and *proportionate* rewards in the king-

dom of heaven for all that had made any sacrifice for His name's sake. But He reproved the bargaining tone His ear had caught in Peter's question, by uttering the oracular words (chap. xix. 30), which the parable is further to explain: "But many shall be last that are first, and first that are last."

Trustful service in the parable manifestly corresponds to sacrifice "for my name's sake" in the context. Now when Christ says, "Shall receive an hundredfold" (or, as some read, "manifold"), He not only declares the largeness of his rewards, but He states that there is a proportion between the reward and the sacrifice. The parable, as commonly understood, has nothing to correspond to this. The penny, which the bargaining could claim, is a poor enough equivalent for the largeness of Christ's promise, but it is no equivalent at all as a proportionate recompense.

3. This interpretation, moreover, *gives an adequate account of the purpose served, in the parable, by the intermediate labourers.* The view commonly received makes no acknowledgment of the element of *time*, so prominently brought forward in connection with the calling of these men. It fails to mark wherein they differ from each other, or to justify the introduction of any intermediate labourers at all. These unhappy men — and most of them had borne the burden and heat of the day as well as their bargaining comrades— do spend their strength for nought and in vain. They crowd the vineyard, and cumber the parable, and create confusion in the reckoning. Why should we overlook the circumstance that the hour of entering the vineyard is so carefully noted in the case of each group of labourers? It seems reasonable to suppose that this fact has some bearing on the amount of hire to be paid. The Steward, at least, is likely to have considered it in this light. But if it entered into his calculations, it must also enter into ours. Surely it is plain that our Lord, at the outset of the story, is supplying us with *data* for estimating the hire of all the trustful labourers. In view of the information there supplied, it needed not that he should state explicitly the remuneration actually given, save in the case of the first and the last. This would have lessened the sharpness of the contrast in the end. The reckoning would have been needlessly protracted. The length of the service, rather than the trustfulness of it, would have appeared in the foreground. The amount of the remuneration would have withdrawn our attention from the generosity of the standard whereby it is ruled.

It is said concerning the bargaining labourers, that when they came to receive their hire "they supposed that they should have received more." On what grounds did they suppose so? Payment had begun with a penny in the case of the eleventh-hour men; and, according to the common view, each successive group had been paid off with the same amount. There was nothing in this to justify any expectation of larger reward. On the contrary, there was a sufficiently wide experience to make this extremely improbable. But how easy to account for this supposition if the Householder's estimate of what is "right" be conceived of as an ascending grade of recompense through all the intermediate groups. We can well imagine how expectation rose. Wages were increasing rapidly. Starting with a sum equal to a whole day's wage for a single hour they had reached, in the case of the third-hour labourers, an amount nine times as large; when suddenly, in the case of the bargainers, payment falls to the penny with which it began. Disappointment breaks out in murmuring in presence of the Steward; but the murmuring is wholly confined to the first or bargaining group, although others, too, had "borne the heat of the day." It reaches the lord of the vineyard as an open complaint wholly directed against the last. "These last have wrought but one hour, and thou hast made *them equal unto us.*" In the Householder's reply, the main contrast of the parable again sweeps into view: "Friend, didst not thou *agree* with me for a penny?" And it is still, as between the first and the last, that the remuneration is affirmed to be equal: "I will give unto this last even as unto thee."

4. Our argument is, perhaps, at its strongest, in *vindicating the character of the lord of the vineyard.*

It is not to be denied that most persons in reading this parable, as it is commonly understood, have a certain vague feeling that there is something in it to which they do not easily reconcile themselves. They hardly know, perhaps, what it is that offends them, or where it lies. The lord of the vineyard does more than fulfil his bargain; but there is a haughtiness in the tone of his voice, as he claims to "do what he will with his own." His words may silence, but they do not satisfy. The reflection that, in the spiritual sphere, Heaven's ways are not as our ways, fails to reassure us; for we know that they are better. That all should receive the same remuneration is disappointing; and we can only hope that, as these men dealt trustfully with their employer, so they may afterwards deal honourably with each other. We are glad the one-hour labourers were so bountifully rewarded. We do not sympathise with the murmuring of those that had wrought all day. But the conviction keeps recurring, that there is a want of fair dealing somewhere; and, with this conviction in our mind, we are fain to conclude that the complainers, although acting ungracefully and foolishly, had morally the best of the argument. It does not surprise us that the Householder's goodness is evil spoken of. A gloomy arbitrariness casts a darkness over his benevolence, not penetrable by the light of any star.

The lord of the vineyard claims to have done the bargaining men "no wrong." And so far, the ordinary view may suffice to acquit him of injustice. But it will not acquit him of the far graver charge of wronging those that trusted him. For as these men, on entering the vineyard, were promised "whatsoever was right," so are they called at the evening time to receive their "hire." The trustful as well as the bargaining are to be paid for their *work*. As between the first and the last, it is undoubtedly just that the employer should deal with the one according to agreement, and with the other according to his own more generous estimate. But it is not consistent with justice, that the payment of those who all alike laboured trustfully should be irrespective of the amount of their toil. Their trustfulness gives them the advantage of the Householder's more liberal standard; but their labour entitles them still to its proportionate value.

By setting the conduct of the Householder in the clear light of principle, our view vindicates his *justice* (ver. 4). Enough has been said to show in how high a degree it enhances his *generosity*. It abundantly justifies his claim to be acknowledged "good" (ver. 15).

5. Lastly. *This view vindicates the consistency of Christ's Teaching*. That all shall receive according to their works is everywhere declared to be the principle whereby the awards of Christian service shall be ruled. Why should we, by a quite gratuitous assumption, make this principle to appear in distorted shape in a parable that treats of this very theme?

The inference, that it matters not when we begin to work for God, lies so obviously on the surface of the view, that assigns to all labourers an equal recompense, that all expositors find it needful to discredit so fatal an idea. But to show that it is false in the spiritual sphere is not enough to defend the parable, unless it can be shown to be unreasonable as an inference. Now, on the common view, it is not unreasonable. We must deny the assumption on which it rests. He who spoke the parable has Himself provided against so ruinous an inference. For the story, as we have read it anew, not only affords no ground for this idea, but indicates how very greatly the reckoning will be affected by delaying to enter on the service of our Lord.

The parable thus presents, in beautiful harmony, the working of man and the generosity of God. Here is a Pisgah height, whence we may behold, in one far-reaching prospect, the fair heritage of grace, and the rewards of human effort. The goodness of the lord of the vineyard blends with the worth of the labourer's faithful toil. The teaching of Paul and the teaching of James meet in the parable of Christ.

If it be asked how it comes to pass that the recompense of these labourers has always been assumed to be, in every case, the same, we reply that this idea is a remnant from an older view concerning the main purpose of the parable. Time was when the chief lesson of the parable was supposed to be stamped on the penny. The penny was Salvation, and the bearing of the parable was to show that as the chief of sinners might be saved, so the holiest and the best could not be more than saved. In this interpretation, it was, of course, inevitable that the recompense should be held to be the same for all. This view survives also in the application that is sometimes made of the thought of the "Eleventh Hour." There is no need to show how foreign this view is to the spirit of both the parable and the context. It never arose from the exposition of Scripture; it was a doctrinal key believed to fit every lock, and very confidently applied to this. The doctrine may be true, but as an exposition of the parable it has long been set aside. Our Lord is speaking not about Salvation, but about Service; not about entering into peace with God, but about entering into work; and about the spirit that brings work into relation to the exceeding generosity of heaven.

The more careful Exegesis of modern times has placed the penny in a quite subordinate place. It lays stress on the contrast between the bargaining of the first and the faith of the last. But the "equal penny," received by tradition from our fathers, has hitherto obscured the generosity of the Householder, and the truth and the beauty of the parable.

The Religious Literature of the Month.

BOOKS.

Dr. Stalker has prepared a new edition of his **Life of Jesus Christ**, one of the Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, crown 8vo, pp. 155, 1s. 6d.). We are thankful to see that he has not altered the text. A vivid picturesque style is the one thing which never grows old or loses its charm. The notes have been carefully revised and brought up to date, the best literature which has appeared since its first issue being skilfully noted. This new edition should be got and placed beside the old. It is one of the few books of which we may afford to have two copies.

Dr. Sanday has also issued a new edition of **The Oracles of God** (London: Longmans & Co., crown 8vo, pp. xvi, 156, 4s.). It may never attain to Dr. Stalker's "thirty-fourth thousand," but no one will be surprised at the demand for a second edition in so short a time. While the whole book is carefully revised, the only important addition is a supplement to the first Appendix, the joint contribution of Dr. Driver and Dr. Sanday. Cursory readers of the work need not heed it, but the careful reader will perceive the value of it. Its bearing is upon the date of the Psalter, *questio vexatissima* at this particular time.

Romans Dissected: A Critical Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans. By E. D. M'Realsham (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, crown 8vo, pp. 76, 2s.). It has always been reckoned a great joy that when Baur and Tübingen cut away all the rest of the Pauline letters, they left the first four to Paul and us. Much has been made out of the concession. Many feeble knees have been stayed, and sometimes even bold unbelievers triumphantly answered. But it was a concession which could not always be given. The wonder is that it has been left us so long. Already some ripples have been seen upon the German Ocean. But, strange to say, it is across the Atlantic that the remorseless wave has come to devour and spare not.

Our hope is in the name. There is something suspiciously friendly in the Mac. And, then, trying the letters another way, the result is both surprising and reassuring.

The Christian Home: Its Foundation and Duties. By W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., crown 8vo, pp. xiv, 287, 6s. 6d.). *The Christian Home*, which is dedicated to the Lord Bishop of London, contains the substance of three courses of lectures delivered last year in London, Oxford, and Worcester. There are thirteen in all—Love and Courtship, Marriage, Parent and Child, Unhappy Homes, The Home beyond the Grave, are some of the titles—and two Appendices on Marriage and Divorce, and on Marriage with the Sister of a Deceased Wife. Throughout the book Canon Knox Little maintains an irreconcilable opposition to the modern tendency to loosen the ties of marriage and tamper with the sanctities of home life. It is an earnest plea for the Christian sacredness of the family and the home, a plea which gradually gathers strength with the accumulation of instance and appeal till it seems as if it could not be resisted.

Alresford Essays for the Times. By Rev. W. O. Newnham, M.A., late Rector of Alresford (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., crown 8vo, pp. x, 292, 6s.). It will be perceived that there is no mystery or forgotten allusion in the title *Alresford Essays*. The parishioners of Alresford heard these Essays ("though in a different guise") from the pulpit, and Mr. Newnham was wise to add a name so unforgettable (when once mastered) to his otherwise quite commonplace title. There are seven essays—The Bible Story of Creation, Eternal Punishment, After Death, Miracles, Eden, the Deluge, and the Resurrection of the Body. The order is puzzling. But so, in a measure, are the essays themselves. The first is conservative, and strange and new are the arguments Conservatism here lies down with. One begins to fear that the first book of the Bible is to become as mysterious and mystifying in its various interpretations as the last. The second essay is not what we have been wont to consider the mark of Conservatism, for it is a clever and telling argument against everlasting punishment. But the whole work is clever, and sometimes surprisingly convincing, even where one least expects or hopes to be convinced.

MAGAZINES.

The Century (Fisher Unwin, 1s. 4d.) has amongst other articles that are valuable, one of peculiar interest on "Fetichism in Congo Land," by Mr. E. J. Glave, one of Stanley's pioneer officers. The account of that mysterious rite, that Eleusinian mystery of the Congo, called the Nkimba, is quite fascinating. A boy, being captured, is carried to the hidden dwelling of the Nganga or Fetichman, where he is kept sometimes for two years. His body is chalked entirely white, and a strange dress of straight dry grass fronds is put upon him. He sees no relative, and dare not look on the face of any woman. He learns the mystical language of the Nkimba, and is initiated into the mysterious rites; but what they are, or what the language is, no white man has yet been able to discover. Meantime the lad is dead to the outer world; and when he returns to his people at the end of his probation, this idea is strictly carried out both by him and them; he is understood to have returned from the grave, the dead come to life again. Can it be, as Mr. Glave thinks, that it is a perverted recollection of Roman Catholic teaching, a relict of the Portuguese discovery of the Congo?

The Young Man (Partridge & Co., 3d.) has an article by the Rev. F. Ballard, M.A., on "The Bible and Science." "Let us mark at the outset," he says most opportunely, "that the terms 'Bible' and 'Science' are not correlatives. It is of decided importance to see that no opposition between these two can be logically affirmed. For they are not antithetical, and therefore cannot clash. So far is this from being a mere verbal quibble, that it would be quite true to say that the heart of the whole difficulty we are dealing with is in this distinction. The real correlatives are the Bible and Nature, Theology and Science. The former, in every case, is the matter to be examined. In the latter, we have the method of examination. What, therefore, Nature is to Science, that the Bible is to Theology."

Printed by Morrison & Gibb, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

No Programme is ever quite satisfactory. Some of the promises made may never see their accomplishment. On the other hand, it is true of every magazine, but the very name and purpose of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES make it true in an especial degree of this magazine, that many of the contributions are born of some occasion which arises, and cannot be promised before the occasion comes. For the most part, therefore, we shall endeavour to do our work without preliminary announcement. But it is reasonable that, before entering upon a new and greatly enlarged series, something should be said about the prospect that lies before us.

But, first of all, we must emphasise the statement that our aim is to be in constant touch with current literature and life. Some contributors, accordingly, recognising this, make no distinct promise beforehand, but hold themselves ready to be called upon as the necessity or the opportunity appears. Others undertake themselves to watch the occasion, and to send such articles and notes as may seem appropriate. Dr. Alexander Whyte, of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, will send an article before the end of the year; and Professor Margoliouth of Oxford will be a contributor to the issue for October. Canon Driver will also "contribute from time to time a note or short article." And amongst others who may be looked for sooner or later to render aid, not yet defined, are Principal Cave, Professor Vincent Stanton, Dr. W. Garden Blaikie, Dr. Herber Evans, Dr. Marshall Lang, Dr. W. P. Dickson, Professor Adams, Professor Stewart, Dr. Clifford, Principal Edwards of Pontypool, Principal Gethin Davies, Professor Orr, Professor Laidlaw, Archdeacon Farrar, Principal Fairbairn, Dr. Hugh Macmillan, Canon Cheyne, Professor Sanday, and Dr. A. B. Davidson. We need not at present stay to enumerate the separate articles promised, or already in hand. Many of them are of exceptional interest, but they will appear in their order.

Professor Henry Jones, M.A., of University College, North Wales, has recently issued, through Messrs. Maclehose, a study of Robert Browning as a philosophical and religious teacher, which has been received with exceptional favour. Those who have read the book (those who have not may form some dim idea of its charm from the sentences we quote elsewhere) will be pleased to hear that Professor Jones will contribute a series of papers on Browning to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. The first paper may be looked for in the issue for October. Thereafter every issue will contain some literary article. Miss Mary A. Woods, of Clifton College, will write on John Milton, of whom she has made a special study. And, later, we hope that the Rev. John Smith, M.A., Edinburgh, will say something of the value of the earlier English poets to the student and expositor of the Word.

Under the title of "My Most Useful Books" some scholars will contribute papers which will not only be good to read, but of immediate practical value, especially to younger men. Prin-

cipal Harding has written the first of these papers, and it will appear very soon. The short articles on the "Literature of the Books of the Bible" will be continued. Principal Harding may be expected to send some of them, while others will be done by Professor Salmond, Dr. Agar Beet, Professor Banks, and other scholars.

Besides the contributions already referred to, the October issue will be enriched by an article on the University of Leipzig, by Professor Caspar René Gregory. This will be the first of a series of articles on the "Study of Theology at various Universities and Colleges at Home and Abroad." Leipzig has many great names, some of them, such as Delitzsch, familiar in our mouths as household words, whose work and influence will be touched upon, and Professor Gregory, the first foreigner, we believe, ever appointed in a German University to the chair of a *Professor Ordinarius*, has exceptional opportunities for the writing of an accurate narrative. The next article in the series will probably be on the Baptist Colleges, by a distinguished Baptist Professor of Theology.

Church History and Christian Ethics claim attention, but we shall not make any definite announcement yet.

In regard to Biblical Archæology, on the other hand, definite arrangements have been made of great importance. We have already spoken of Professor Sayce. Professor Whitehouse also, the translator of Schrader, who keeps himself abreast of the work that is being done over the whole field, will send us notes and criticisms frequently. Professor Ramsay and Professor Kennedy are engaged at present in the formation of a very valuable archæological library at Aberdeen, in connection with the Wilson Archæological Museum, and readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES may expect to share the stores of knowledge there at command.

But an engagement of far greater magnitude than any of these has been entered into with Mr. Theo. G. Pinches, of the British Museum. When the second edition of Dr. Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* was issued, students of the monuments were amazed and delighted at the great increase in its size over the first edition. And it has been a mine of wealth ever since to every preacher and student of Scripture who has been fortunate enough to possess it. But it is nearly ten years since that second edition was published. Few have any conception of what that means in such a science; the fresh gains being simply enormous. Moreover, although Schrader's method of taking up the Old Testament verse by verse from the beginning, and introducing all that bore upon its explanation or illustration, was the right one, he was not always successful, either in his translations or in his arrangement. Mr. Pinches has undertaken to go over the whole field again. He will incorporate the new material with Schrader's work; he will arrange it all more clearly; and in a much more readable form, he will contribute it in a series of papers to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

All this is certainly exposition. But it is time we had said something of what our prospects are in respect of the direct exegesis and exposition of the Word. Many of the most distinguished expositors have done us the honour to promise notes and articles, of which the subjects are not yet given, among whom we may name the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Rev. Walter Lock, Fellow of Keble College, and the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, Fellow of Hertford College; Professors Marshall and Gould; Principal Douglas and Principal Simon; Dr. Plummer, Dr. Rawson Lumby, Prebendary Whitefoord, and Professor Young. Several of the books, both of the Old Testament and of the New, will receive special attention. The Lord Bishop of Worcester will write on Genesis. Prebendary Bassett, Professor Thomson, Manchester, and Mr. H. Deane, B.D., Oxford, will write on Isaiah. Mr. F. H. Woods will contribute an important study of the Sermon on the Mount. The Dean of Gloucester will send notes on St. Luke. Principal Reynolds will contribute notes upon the Acts and upon the Romans, and Principal M'Clellan will also write upon that Epistle. Finally, the Epistle to the Hebrews will receive the attention of Principal T. C. Edwards,

and others. Many separate papers of equal interest are definitely promised; among them an introductory study of St. John, by Professor Banks; four papers, by Dr. Agar Beet, on certain difficult passages in St. Paul; the Biblical Notion of Divine Covenants, by Professor Candlish, who will write later on the meaning of Life and Death in the Bible; and we must not forget Principal David Brown, who, himself one of the Revisers, will send a short series in his forcible style, under the title of "Some Gains in the Revised Version of the New Testament, and some the Reverse."

Manifestly this is no programme that can be exhausted in a few months. Our readers will accordingly draw the conclusion that we look forward with confidence to the result of the step that is now to be taken. But we wish always to bear it in mind that if we are to be successful we must deserve it. Therefore those lighter features, for which THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has been often most favourably spoken of, will henceforth take and hold their place.

1. The Notes of Recent Exposition will be the opening feature still, and will be enlarged.

2. The Great Text Commentary will appear every month, and a portion of the Index to Modern Sermons will be given in every issue.

3. The Guild will have an important place. Full particulars of the working of it will be given in next issue. But meantime we shall be glad to receive the names of those who wish to be enrolled. A large number have already been received, including many of the most eminent scholars in all the Churches. We are particularly desirous that laymen and also that ladies should enrol themselves, and shall reckon it a very great favour should our readers bring the special purpose of the Guild, as stated in last issue, under the notice of their friends. Already we have received the names of a considerable number of laymen and of several ladies. We hope shortly to publish the first list of members.

4. The Exposition of the International Lessons, which was omitted with the greatest reluctance (an omission of which there have been many complaints, one recent complainant, the principal of a large school, saying that "they were so short, forceful, fresh, and suggestive"), will reappear.

5. "Point and Illustration" has already returned, not again to be forgotten, we hope.

6. "Requests and Replies," through which so much quiet but effective work has already been done by eminent scholars, will be continued as a regular and important feature of the magazine.

7. Lastly, besides the special literary articles already spoken of, the literary parts of the magazine will be developed. The Surveys of Special Departments will be continued. Fresh notes of forthcoming books will be given. And, especially, an effort will be made every month to announce and briefly to indicate the character of at least all the important books likely to interest our readers, fuller reviews by specialists in many cases coming after.

In a few weeks we shall be in the heart of the publishing season, 1891–92. Already several books have reached us, and if we may judge the summer by its earliest swallows, this season is to be a distinct advance upon the last. Here they are: *The Apostolic Fathers*, by the late Bishop Lightfoot, the student's edition, completed and edited by the Rev. J. R. Harmer, M.A.; *The Origin of the Psalter*, by Canon Cheyne, being the Bampton Lectures for 1889; the first two volumes of an English translation of Professor Graetz's *History of the Jews*; also *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, volume iii.; *Sermons on the Old Testament*, by the late Canon Liddon; and a volume of *Sermons on Special Occasions*, by the late Bishop Lightfoot. Add to these Professor Jones' *Browning as a Philosophical and Religious Teacher*; a monograph on *S. Martin of Tours*, by H. H. Scullard, M.A., being the Hulsean Prize Essay for 1890; and an *Introduction to Cudworth's Treatise*, by W. R. Scott.

It is enough to mention the mere names of those books (and, to our regret, we can do no more this month), to show what the season is likely to bring forth. But those are not all we yet know of. There is at least one other which we count upon having to deal with next month along with those. Dr. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* is announced to appear in September.

In last month's issue the Rev. Charles Connor argued for the payment of the willing labourers in the vineyard according to their length of service. Those who entered at the eleventh hour received a penny, a day's wages for an hour's work, because they trusted the master and left it to his generosity. But all the others, except the first hired, who bargained and blundered, were of an equally trustful disposition, and worked much longer than an hour; and Mr. Connor gave several reasons for believing that they received more than a penny, in fact that they were paid at the rate of a penny an hour, according to the length of their service. Mr. W. T. Lynn, B.A., now writes to say that Mr. Connor's argument, "ingenious as it is," has failed to convince him. He thinks that if the third hour labourers had received so large a sum as this would imply, the bargaining labourers who got only their penny would have grumbled against them rather than against the eleventh hour labourers. That is to say, they would have been more struck with the disproportion in the sums than in the service. Mr. Lynn, to whom we have been indebted for scholarly notes more than once, says very properly that we are not entitled to draw anything out of a parable beyond the one especial lesson it is intended to illustrate. In the case of the labourers in the vineyard that lesson is, that it is the trustfulness not the amount of the service we render which God appreciates. The question of varying reward for trustful service, according to the length of it, does not come in. But it may be true for all that—this parable says nothing against it and other Scripture may assert it — that the longer service does receive the greater reward. "Many," not all, "that are first shall be last."

But now, does not Mr. Lynn himself find something in the parable beyond its one especial lesson when he says: "Why He sees fit to call some earlier, others later in life, is a matter beyond our cognisance, and of which He gives no account to us"? The earthly master did so, because it is to be supposed his vineyard was limited, and he needed only a certain number of men to work it. He therefore hired in the beginning of the day as many as he really required, expecting that other masters would come round and hire the rest who were there. Then, out of great pity, he went out and hired others, and yet others, when he found that no other man had hired them. But is this the way with the divine Master? Is He limited to a selection because the work is too narrow for more? Has He not work enough for us all? Are not the labourers who are willing to be hired really too few for the great plenteousness of the harvest? If not, surely even the eleventh hour labourers are greatly to be pitied.

But in any case, whether they persisted in refusing the invitation or never received it, are they not greatly to be pitied? Standing all the day idle! "Doubtless," says Mr. Lynn, "many a service has been rendered before this special call has been given, many a cup of cold water has been given while outside the vineyard, which we are assured shall in no wise lose its reward." But even if they had the heart to render some such occasional hand's turn of work while waiting in the market-place, if they did not know to whom they rendered it, are they not greatly to be pitied? We think of their surprise and pleasure when the generous reward for their one hour's work was placed in their hand. Perhaps we think of the joy of the one hour's work itself. But what of the long day's waiting in the market-place, while others pass in to work and wages, having the wish to go perhaps without the will, or even the will to go without the call? Surely in either case they are greatly to be pitied.

Idlers all day about the market-place
They name us, and our dumb lips answer not,
Bearing the bitter while our sloth's disgrace,
And our dark tasking whereof none may wot.

Oh, the fair slopes where the grape-gatherers go!—
Not they the day's fierce heat and burden bear,
But we who on the market-stones drop slow
Our barren tears, while all the bright hours wear.

Lord of the Vineyard, whose dear word declares
Our one hour's labour as the day's shall be;
What coin divine can make our wage as theirs
Who had the morning joy of work for Thee?

The Early Narratives of Genesis.

By the Rev. Professor H. E. Ryle, M.A., Cambridge.

III.

THE STORY OF PARADISE.

We are brought to the consideration of the second section in the Early Narratives of Genesis which seems to offer itself for separate treatment. In these two chapters (ii. 4–iii.) the narrative falls naturally into two divisions, of which the first (chap. ii. 4–25) is occupied with a description of the creation of man, his first dwelling-place, and the formation of the vegetable and animal world; the second (chap. iii.) narrates the account of the Temptation, the Fall, and the Judgment consequent upon it.

We can do very little more than just touch upon some of the more important points to be noticed in the literary structure, origin, and religious teaching of this important narrative.

(*a*) *Structure.* — Many a reader has been surprised to notice that a description of the Creation occurs in the second chapter, when the successive stages of the Creation have already formed the theme of the previous passage. According to the explanation that has generally been given, the double narrative is intended to furnish an account of the same events regarded from different points of view. And, undoubtedly, in the first chapter the Creation is described in its relation to the Physical Universe, the formation of man marking the concluding feature of the whole, whereas in the second chapter it is described in its relation primarily to Man, each portion of the universe being called into existence in order to contribute to the benefit of the human race. No one would contest the existence of this difference of view in the two descriptions, nor the possibility of the same writer describing the same events in different ways. But the divergence of view is not sufficient to account for the absence in chap. ii. 4–25 of any reference to the Days of Creation, or for the statements which differ so widely from the contents of chap. i., as ii. 5–7, where we read that when man was made neither plant nor herb yet existed; and ii. 8, 9, 19, where it appears that the vegetable and animal world owed their origin to the purpose of satisfying the needs of man; and ii. 21–23, where we find that the formation of woman as a help-meet for man was an act of Divine favour consequent upon his inability to find true companionship in the brute creation. Now it may fairly be said that we certainly do not expect a writer, who is going a second time over the same facts for the purpose of describing them from a different standpoint, to refrain from any hint of his change of purpose, to give no sign that he is conscious of going over the same ground, and to make no allusion to his first narrative. This, however, is what we find on a comparison of Gen. ii. 4*b*–25 with Gen. i. 1–ii. 4*a*; and, as Hebrew scholars have pointed out, the anomalous character of the two chapters as a piece of literature, emanating, on the traditional view, from a single writer, strangely coincides with a change in the style and diction. For although the change in the use of the Divine Name from "Elohim" to "Jehovah Elohim" has been accounted for (but with insufficient reason) on the ground of a change in the general attitude of thought, the alteration both in the literary style of the narrative and in the choice of words and phrases has been conclusively demonstrated.

Modern criticism has removed the difficulty. Scholars have proved—and men of all schools now recognise—that this section (ii. 4–iii.) is not homogeneous with chap. i.–ii. 4*a*. The compiler of Genesis has here incorporated material from another source, to which the name of "Jehovist" (or "Yahwist") has been commonly given by critics. The first portion of Genesis was drawn from the so-called Elohist source, and, as has before been mentioned, belongs to the "priestly" group of writings; the second section is derived from the prophetic group. The style of the former is formal and methodical; the style of the latter is varied, full of incident, and replete with descriptive details and personal allusions. (Further discussion

of this point is not needed by readers of The Expository Times, who may be referred to the clear and useful article of the Rev. F. H. Woods on the subject in the February number of this year.)

The compiler of Genesis selects from two recognised Hebrew traditions parallel extracts descriptive of the work of Creation. He places them side by side, so that we are able to compare their different characteristics. This plan of selecting from different sources he pursues in other portions of the history, and we shall have occasion to observe a noteworthy example in the double account of the Deluge, where he has pieced together extracts from the different sources.

The fact that the compiler makes no attempt to harmonise them rigorously illustrates his method of work. He had no desire to obliterate the characteristic feature of the writings out of which he constructed his continuous narrative. His sole object was to furnish his countrymen with an authoritative narrative, which should preserve the traditions of his race at the same time that it was the means of embodying the essential teaching of the Religion of Jehovah.

(*b*) *Origin.*—It is not perhaps to be wondered at that an inquiry into the origin and growth of the Paradise narrative should be involved in much obscurity. It is certainly strange that no reference is made to it in the writings of the earlier Hebrew prophets. The garden of Eden is alluded to by the prophets of the Captivity, *e.g.* Ezek. xxviii. 13, xxxi. 9, Isa. li. 3. A mention of it occurs in the Book of Joel (ii. 3), but the age of that work is much disputed, and no conclusive evidence as to pre-exilic usage could be drawn from it. The Book of Proverbs, in the occasional mention of "the tree of life," very possibly contains allusions to our narrative. But any other early reference to it is so meagre, and at the best so doubtful, that we are compelled to infer either that the Israelite narrative was hardly known before the Exile, or that the form in which it has come down to us was not generally known, and, at least, was not in early times recognised as a portion of sacred tradition.

The former of these alternatives has been somewhat hastily adopted by some eminent scholars. The narrative of the Fall, they have asserted, received its literary form after the Captivity; the narrative itself was derived from Babylon. With this reasoning I find myself quite unable to agree. For, apart from the consideration mentioned in a previous paper, that the captive Jews were little likely, and the pious members of the community least of all, to enrich the sacred traditions of the chosen people from the legends of their captors, it appears to me to be defective in two other ways:—(1) Criticism has fairly established it, that this section belongs to the Jehovistic group of writings; large portions of this group incontestably existed at a much earlier date than the Exile; the general character of the Paradise narrative favours the supposition that it does not belong to the later but rather to the earlier portions of the Jehovistic narrative. (2) There are details in the descriptive language which forbid us to look for any direct derivation from a Babylonian source. It is not probable that Jews residing in Babylon would have accepted the geographical description in ii. 11–14, which contained such an indefinite allusion to "Assyria," or would have introduced a mention of the "fig-tree" (iii. 7), a tree which happens not to be a native of Babylonia.

It is better to account for the absence of allusion to the Paradise narrative in the earlier prophets by the supposition that the narrative was not for a long time cleared from the mythological element, and could not therefore have been admitted among the most sacred traditions of the religion of Israel. Of course it would be useless to deny that the Paradise narrative possesses an affinity with the religious traditions and myths of Assyria and Babylonia. But the affinity is not that of direct derivation at the late period of the Babylonian Exile. It is rather an affinity arising from the ultimate derivation of the narrative from an Assyro-Babylonian source, and from the conservative transmission of it through many generations. Thus it has been shown, with every appearance of probability, that some of the most important names and words in the Hebrew narrative reproduce Assyrian words, and that some of the most distinctive features in the story are best illustrated from Assyrian inscriptions. The Assyrian names Diglat and Bura appear in the Hebrew equivalents, Hiddekel (Tigris) and Prâth (Euphrates); the Hebrew Gihon is possibly the Guhan-di, an artificial branch of the Euphrates. In the name of Eden we have the sound of the Assyrian word

"idinu," a "field," or "plain," adapted to the Hebrew root meaning "pleasure"; in the "shôham"-stone (bdellium) we find possibly a Hebrew form of the Assyrian "samtu"; in the name of Abel we discern the Assyrian root for a "scion" or "shoot," the Hebrew transliteration of which suggested the play on the Hebrew word for "a fleeting breath"; in the Hebrew word "*arom*" for "subtle" in Gen. iii. 1, Mr. Boscawen suggests there is a recollection of the Assyrian "*Lu Erim*" or "magician, the greatest foe of man." (*Cf.* Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions*, vol. i.)

As regards the main features of the story, it is impossible not to trace in the sacred trees of "the knowledge of good and of evil" and "of life," a resemblance to the coniferous sacred trees which are depicted in almost every emblematical Assyrian and Babylonian representation. The appearance of the serpent, as the agent of temptation, suggests the Assyrian Tiamat, the evil serpent overthrown by Merodach; and the fact that in several inscriptions the serpent is *aibu ilani*, "the enemy of the gods" (so Boscawen) illustrates the resemblance of the Genesis narrative to the mythology of Assyro-Babylonia. The cherubim which were stationed to guard the approach to the garden of Eden have suggested comparison with the colossal griffins that stood at the entrance of Assyrian temples.

These points of resemblance, however, only touch the outer framework of our Paradise narrative. So far, the most that could be said would be that the Assyrian dialect was visible through the Hebrew form of certain proper names, and that features in the story were capable of being illustrated in an interesting manner from Assyrian and Babylonian monuments. Until a few months ago it could not be asserted, with any confidence, that the inscriptions showed any trace of an Assyrian or Babylonian counterpart to the biblical narrative of the Fall. Even the famous representation upon the seal, adduced by George Smith, on which appeared the sacred tree with its clusters of fruit, with the figures of a man and woman on either side of it, and of a serpent in an erect posture standing behind the woman, did not convince scholars that this was an allusion to the narrative of the Fall. "We certainly," said Schrader (Eng. trans., i. p. 38), "have no right to assert that the Babylonians had no story of a Fall, although no written accounts bearing upon it have hitherto come to hand. We merely contend that it is not presupposed in the above figured representation."

All doubt, however, on the subject has recently been removed. There can now be no longer any question that a narrative of the Fall was included in the literature of the Assyro-Babylonian religion. The conclusive evidence was brought to light by the eminent English Assyriologist, Mr. W. St. C. Boscawen, who made known his discovery in an article on "The Babylonian Legend of the Serpent Tempter," in the October (1890) number of *The Babylonian and Oriental Record*. The most important fresh testimony which he adduces is obtained from a translation of a passage contained in the much mutilated Third Creation Tablet, "which describes the various wicked acts of the Serpent Tiamat."

The important fragment, as rendered by Mr. Boscawen, runs as follows:—

> "The great gods, all of them determiners of fate,
> They entered, and, death-like, the god Sar filled.
> In sin one with the other in compact joins.
> The command was established in the garden of the God.
> The Asnan (fruit) they ate, they broke in two,
> Its stalk they destroyed;
> The sweet juice which injures the body.
> Great is their sin. Themselves they exalted.
> To Merodach their Redeemer he appointed their fate."

"It is almost impossible," continues the translator, "not to see in this fragment the pith of the story of the Fall, while the last line at once brings Merodach before us as the one who would defeat the tempter and restore the fallen. . . . The more we examine the position of Merodach in the Babylonian mythology the more we see how closely it approaches the Hebrew conception of the Messiah. He was the son of the great earth-mother Dav-Kina, the wife of Ea, and bore as his own name that of *Mar-dugga*, 'the Holy Son.' He was the mediator between gods and men, healing sickness, forgiving sin, raising the dead, not by his own power, but by that of his father Ea; and now we find him acting as the redeemer of the fallen pair. We may be sure that the importance of this small fragment to biblical students is very great indeed."

Mr. Boscawen further points out that the tree is called "the Asnan tree," and that the word "Asnan," being a derivative from the root "to

repeat," means "double fruit" or "double tree," and may account for the double form given to the tree in sculptures and for the mention of the two trees in the garden. Again, he calls attention to the mention of the gods entering "in a death-like manner," which may be understood to illustrate the words of the Hebrew narrative, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. ii. 17).

It remains to be seen how far Mr. Boscawen's rendering is confirmed by other scholars. But the main character of it is not likely to be widely different. And without committing ourselves to all the inferences which Mr. Boscawen would be prepared to draw from his translation, we may heartily welcome the discovery. The gap that had seemed so strange is now filled up; the Israelite narrative of the Fall stands in the same relation to Assyro-Babylonian legend as the narrative of the Creation and the Flood.

As in their case, so also in the case of the Paradise narrative, the resemblance is best explained on the assumption of derivation from an ultimately common source in the religious mythology of Mesopotamia. The original tradition, marred with the intricacies of a bewildering polytheism, was received from their Mesopotamian ancestors by the founders of the Israelite branch of the Semitic race. The manifestation of a purer religion made itself felt upon the heritage of popular tradition. The form in which it was eventually incorporated among the sacred writings of Israel still bore a genuine resemblance to the kindred legend of Babylonia; its story, which still carried in words and names the impress of its origin, was invested with the simple dignity characteristic of pure monotheism, and was inspired to express vividly and pictorially some of the profoundest truths which distinguished the spiritual religion of Israel above all religions of antiquity. Thus did the Holy Spirit overrule the preparation of the volume of "The Word of Life."

Many are the ingenious and many the absurd speculations which have been started for the purpose of identifying the locality of the garden of Eden. The most interesting, and by far the most plausible contribution to this investigation, was the celebrated *brochure* of Prof. Fried. Delitzsch, entitled, "Wo lag das Paradies?" This was an attempt to identify the site of the garden of Eden with a district of Babylonia between the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, and formerly intersected by artificial canals. The ingenuity of the arguments by which this eminent Assyriologist maintained his view cannot be denied; but, on the whole, the impression produced by its elaboration was that it was more clever than convincing.

It is possible to be prejudiced in the matter; and I confess I am one of those who have neither the wish nor the expectation that the site of Paradise will ever be identified. In my opinion the possibility of identification rests upon the erroneous supposition that the language used in Gen. ii. 8–14 is intended to convey an accurate geographical description. The proper names of the original tradition have been transliterated in the Hebrew narrative into forms in common use among the Israelites, and most nearly resembling them in pronunciation. One example will suffice. The word "Cush," in ver. 13, would inevitably convey to the Hebrew reader the meaning of "Ethiopia"; but it is evident that no river near the Tigris and the Euphrates could be associated with Ethiopia, and the suggestion is possible that the Hebrew word "Cush" was here used in consequence of a confusion between Cas, a district in Babylonia, or the Cossaei, the dwellers of Southern Babylonia, and Cush, the well-known name of African Nubia. Thus even supposing, as I for one should not be prepared to do, that the language of the original tradition indicated a well-known locality in Western Asia, the transmutation of the Assyrian proper names into similarly sounding Hebrew names makes all attempts at recognition doubtful guesswork. But surely accurate geographical description is not to be expected from even the earliest form in which this Semitic "myth" was known to the dwellers in Mesopotamia. And are we to expect a greater degree of accuracy from its later forms, whether Assyrian or Hebrew, which have been altered and modified in order to be brought into harmony with the religious thought of a more advanced period in the history of the race?

Is not the real conception of the locality to be derived from the language in which it is described? It is a garden in which the Almighty walked, and in which the serpent spoke. It is a place where

man, after the Fall, could no longer remain; and at the gates of it winged dragons were stationed to prevent man from attempting to re-enter it.

(*c*) *Religious Teaching.* — The description belongs to the poetry of the early Israelite legend. The spiritual teaching which the narrative conveys comprises some of "the deep things" of the Israelite religion.

It taught how in the ideal state, before sin came into the world, man could dwell in the sunlight of the Divine Presence. The true Paradise was the place where God had put him; there he enjoyed the ideal existence. He lived in the exercise of his physical powers; he tended the garden. He enjoyed the command of his intellectual faculties; he named and discriminated the animals. He was a social being, and received, in the institution of marriage, the perfecting of human companionship.

But the blessing of the Divine Presence was conditional upon obedience to the Divine will. Paradise is forfeited by the preference of selfish appetites over the command of God. The expulsion from Paradise was the inevitable consequence of sin; the desire of man for the lower life was granted. He who asserts his own against the Divine will has no place in the Paradise of God. The very powers of the sky, which testify to His might, seem to bar the way to the Most High, and exclude the fallen ones from hope of return.

The very simplicity of the sin, which stands in such startling contrast to the tremendous character of its consequences, is not uninstructive. For it taught how the purpose, even more than the act, is judged in God's sight. It was not the harmfulness of the act but the rebellion and disobedience against God that brought the condemnation.

The motive impulse to sin was not inherent in man's nature. The temptation came from without him. He was not doomed by nature to fall, but he was gifted with the God-like faculty of free-will. The submission of free-will to something lower than the Divine will led to the Fall.

The Fall brought sin and evil in its train. It was no isolated act of wrong-doing. It was infinite in its results. Its effects were felt in the Universe, shared by the creatures, and transmitted to all generations among men. Thus does the narrative illustrate the solidarity of the human race. Modern investigations into heredity have strangely and unexpectedly confirmed its teaching. The thought of such "original sin" were enough to overwhelm us in despair, were it not that in the Person of the Second Adam we have a far more exceeding hope of glory—not the self-preservation but the corporate reunion of our race in Christ Jesus our Lord.

The length to which this paper has already grown makes it advisable to break off at this point, and to defer till another number the remainder of our investigation into the religious teaching of this narrative.

The Joshua Miracle.

In the May number of The Expository Times an account is given, from the *Homiletic Review*, of the late Dr. Howard Crosby's views on the miracle which occurred during the battle of Beth-horon, as related in the Book of Joshua. When non-scientific writers enter into discussions respecting matters in which science is involved, the results are often unfortunate, and the present is a case in point. Dr. Howard Crosby thinks that the miracle took place in the early part of the day. And this was undoubtedly the fact, as is evident from the geographical position of the locality, situated to the north-west of Gibeon, so that the sun must have been in the south-east, and therefore rising, or shortly about to rise, over the latter place. But Dr. Howard Crosby goes on to suggest that the apparent upward movement of the sun was arrested for some considerable time by an abnormal refraction, causing it to remain apparently stationary in the heavens. Now the effect of refraction is always to *elevate* the apparent position of a heavenly body; so that an abnormal amount of refraction when the sun was rising, or in any part of the morning, would be not to arrest, but to accelerate, its upward apparent movement.

I have very little doubt that the true exposition of the Joshua miracle is that which was first suggested by the late Dr. Pratt of Brighton, and has more recently been ably worked out in detail with much wealth of illustration by the Rev. A. Smythe Palmer in his work, published in 1888, under the title *A Misunderstood Miracle.* It consists in this, that what was prayed for was a prolongation not of daylight, but of darkness at a time when the object of the forced night-march seemed about to be frustrated by the sun approaching its rising and bringing on broad daylight. The darkness was, therefore, by the Divine favour prolonged by a very thick and dark atmosphere, which enabled the Israelites to carry out their unexpected attack upon the bewildered Amorites, and complete the rout of their surprised host; the gathering storm shortly afterwards culminating in a shower of hail so violent that we are told the stones killed more of them than the swords of the Israelites had done.

W. T. Lynn, B.A., F.R.A.S.

Blackheath, London, S.E.

A Study of Jeremiah's Use (xviii. 1–17) of the Figure of the Potter.

By the Rev. Professor R. Waddy Moss, Didsbury College, Manchester.

The figure of the Potter is of frequent occurrence in Scripture, but is by no means always used to convey the same lesson. If the more minute modifications are overlooked, its usages may be arranged under two principal heads. In every case the power of the potter over the clay is emphasised. But while some passages stop with that fact—that the potter's power is absolute, without measure or limit; others teach distinctly that the potter is not ruled by his fancy or caprice, or by any momentary or arbitrary impulse, but that the exercise of his power is itself determined by some quality or fitness within the clay. The former lesson is most frequent in Isaiah and Paul, although it is not confined to them (*cf.* Job x. 8–13). In both parts of Isaiah the figure in this sense constantly occurs, with a variety of moral precepts deduced from it (*cf.* xxix. 16, xlv. 9, lxiv. 8, *et al.*). And when St. Paul wanted to indicate the folly of man's disputing with God, he wrote, "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" (Rom. ix. 20, 21). That is the most obvious meaning of the figure, which may be found in almost every literature. Sitting at his frame, the potter can do with the clay what he likes; and as the fancy takes him, can mould a pitcher or a rose-bowl. He at his wheel is the symbol of power; the clay, of helplessness and necessary submission.

The thoroughness of Jeremiah's belief in this first lesson, although he does not appropriate this figure to its expression, is evidenced throughout his prophecy (*cf.* xviii. 6). In i. 5, the truth of Jehovah's absolute rights over man is set forth in an even more unqualified way. And nowhere does the prophet hesitate in his ascription to God of complete control over man, or to man of the obligation of submissive and full obedience. But according to him, that is not a complete account of the relation either of God to man, or of man to God. And in this chapter he uses the figure of the potter to show, on the one hand, that the potter's power is not exercised arbitrarily; and, on the other, that its exercise is determined, and even in some sense conditioned, by the clay itself. That truth, on its two sides, is the principal lesson of this paragraph, suggested by its symbolism, and receiving more forcible utterance as the figure fails to restrain the prophet's indignation against sin.

1. With regard to the figure, it is in the particulars of the fourth verse that Jeremiah's use of it differs from that of most other scriptural writers. Bidden by God, he went down to a potter's workshop, possibly in the valley of Hinnom, where clay seems to have been worked from time immemorial. There he saw a vessel that was being made, "marred in the hand of the potter." It is not an unfamiliar occurrence. Sometimes the fault is the potter's, due to such causes as the presence of grit on his fingers, or a lack of skill in revolving his wheel; and sometimes the cause is in the clay itself, which has not been washed and kneaded to uniform consistency and fineness. Here the whole of the context shows that the last-named cause alone was contemplated by the prophet. And when the potter saw that the clay he was dealing with would not answer the purpose he had in view, he crushed it down into a shapeless heap of mud, began anew, and made it into "another vessel." In other words, the potter's treatment of the clay depends upon his knowledge or discovery of its capabilities. Or, dropping the figure, God does not always carry out His first design with a man, and any change of design on His part is determined by some adequate cause, which is always to be found in the man himself—in the way in which he exercises his freedom of will, or in the attitude in which he puts himself towards conscience and duty and truth. The plastic skill and power of the great Potter, in themselves immeasurable and without limit, do yet depend for their direction, if not for their application, upon the clay.

2. That truth is in the Old Testament an especial favourite of Jeremiah's, and in this single paragraph he is not contented with the dubious form it assumes in the figure, but recurs to it once and again afterwards. The fourteenth verse, which is unintelligible enough in the Authorised Version, is thus rendered by the Revisers, "Shall the snow of Lebanon fail from the rock of the field, or shall the cold waters that come down from afar be dried up?" And when that is compared with the preceding verse, it becomes evident that the prophet wanted to point a contrast between the steadfastness of the phenomena and laws of Nature, and the apparent fickleness of those of morals. To the one the eternal will of God, which knows no change, is central; to the other, the uncertain will of man. And hence "the virgin of Israel" can manage sometimes to do "a very horrible thing"; though the snow of Lebanon never fails, and the springs that it feeds are never dry. That is almost the sole use that Jeremiah makes of illustrations from Nature throughout his prophecy. Whenever he

refers to it, almost without exception, he is thinking of its consistency and order (*cf.* vv. 22, 24, viii. 7, xiii. 23, xxxiii. 20, *et al.*). According to him, the constraint of God is ever upon the so-called powers of Nature, but never in the same sense upon the spirit of man. The only power in the universe, not completely subject to the rule of God, but permitted to rebel against Him and to check and alter His purposes, is man's personality or will. To that extent the Potter renounces his power over the clay, and the clay is allowed to determine the design of the Potter.

3. The same truth is put in a third way in the section, shut in by the seventh verse and the tenth —one of those interesting passages in which the word "repent" is placed upon the lips of Jehovah. Sometimes, as in Gen. vi. 6, the word seems to imply a certain feeling of regret, which it is difficult to harmonise with the qualities that necessarily enter into the conception of a God. In those cases the best that can be said is, perhaps, that God is accommodating Himself to man, revealing Himself according to human modes of thought and speech. But here (vers. 8 and 10) there is no emotional element in the word, which appears to denote nothing more than a change of purpose on the part of God in regard to man. And the meaning evidently is that neither God's threats nor His promises are absolute, in the sense that they are incapable of diversion or of change. But men can actually, by their choice of evil or carelessness concerning right, frustrate God's purposes of grace, just as by penitence and self-reform they can avert a doom that is impending. That is the word of the Lord by others than Jeremiah (*cf.* Ezek. xviii. 20–24). It is in accordance with the teaching of the New Testament, with the teaching of reason, and with the fundamental conception of justice. There is no finality in God's design for a man, until the man's will has either frittered itself away, or hardened itself into invincibility. But by the attitude towards God into which men put themselves, they determine the pattern according to which His methods mould them, and every change of attitude on their part is quickly followed by its appropriate and necessary change of design.

And it is sometimes almost possible to see this process of a change in God's purposes taking place in the affairs of nations and in the careers of individuals. It is often said that through the whole history of the Jews there can be traced one great plan. But whilst that may be true enough of the history as a whole, the plan, if the history be taken in its separate periods and generations, is apt to look a little broken and particoloured,—much like a geological series, at one point deflected downwards, and not cropping up again until miles have been traversed. Concerning the Ninevites again, the record is, "God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way, and God repented of the evil which He said He would do unto them, and He did it not." Jonah himself was designed by God to be a prophet, but the action of his own will made him a sacrifice to appease the sea, until, when he willed better things, God's plan for him changed back again. And Adam was made by God in His own likeness, and intended in some way of perfect innocency to reflect and reproduce on the earth the Divine glory. But because he exercised his will in sin, the spoilt clay was made into a very different vessel. And how easily every man can discover by reflection upon his own life moments in the past, when some evident change took place in the plan according to which the life was unfolding! Of such moments that of conversion is the most important, but by no means the only one. There have been periods of restlessness followed by periods of peace; long weeks during which the spirit was torn and in dismay, succeeded by a time when it seemed to rest quietly upon God: perhaps changes of the opposite kind—designs of grace and purity in the past, and now a manifest drifting of the spirit towards ruin. And thus in Scripture, in history, in human experience, there is cumulative evidence that God does not always carry out His first designs for men, but that those designs are sometimes changed on account of a change of will in the men themselves.

From such a truth it is an immediate inference, that the responsibility for a man's character rests substantially upon himself. God gives, in the conscience and by His spirit, a clear revelation of what is right, and in His Son a source of strength that is sufficient for every duty. He gives opportunities, allurements, warnings without number; and having given those, ceaselessly present with us, His part in the formation of character may be said to be done. The man has then to determine, by the action of his own will, whether the law of perfecting or the law of perdition shall work in him. It is a frequent fancy in our dulness, that the will is altogether too weak to be charged with such a responsibility. Paul thought in that way once, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" and was almost heart-broken until the Spirit of God showed him the means of deliverance, —"through Jesus Christ our Lord." And it is still true that the man who brings his weakness of will and all his moral failures to his Saviour, finds in Him forgiveness, and wisdom, and power, and everything else he needs to brace his spirit and make it pure. Even in Old Testament times, a Psalmist once sang, "I sought the Lord; and He heard me, and delivered me from all my fears;" and again, "The Lord is my strength and my shield; my heart trusted in Him, and I am helped." And that experience is repeated now ever the more readily in the case of a man who really fears God.

The Christian Ministry viewed in the Light of the Ancient Jewish Priesthood.

By the Rev. William J. Adams, D.C.L., Rector of All Saints', Dorchester.

The following questions are of enormous importance in themselves, and in one form or another are coming up for discussion and settlement throughout Christendom. Whether the Christian minister is or is not a priest? Whether salvation is by and through rite and ceremony, or through faith in and personal contact with a living Saviour? Whether men find God or God finds men, through sacraments and a priesthood? Is the presence of a priest necessary in order to transform an assembly into or constitute a Church of Christ?

In reply to these questions we would say in general, that when the vision of God is dim, then it is that men ask for the intervention of a priesthood. Hence it is that in the darkest ages of the Church, sacerdotalism has been most rampant. To take refuge in a vicarious religion is the tendency of human nature. Men are ever ready to be religious by proxy. Ill-instructed Christians naturally seek to commit their religious concerns to a priest, just as they commit the care of their health to the physician. Hence the origin of priestcraft must be traced to the people themselves. They who have just so much of religion (but no more) as to feel it to be proper to worship God in some way are perfectly willing that another, whose life is wholly devoted to religion, should serve God in their stead.

It is contended, however, that this universal tendency of mankind is in harmony with the Divine plan, a vicarious priesthood having been constituted by God Himself under the old Jewish economy, and continued and preserved by the same high sanction in the New Testament Church.

In a previous paper we discussed the nature and functions of the office of the ancient Jewish priest, and were irresistibly led to the conclusion that its essential characteristic was not sacerdotal but ministerial. The prominent idea in the Hebrew word "cohen" we found to be not sacrifice but service, and we adduced a high Jewish authority as well as the use of the term in the Old Testament, to show that, in all probability, the proper and literal rendering of the term כֹּהֵן, *cohen*, which we translate "priest," is "chief minister."

If this be the true significance of the term used to designate the office of the Jewish priest, it follows, that if the Christian ministry be of a sacerdotal character, then it is certainly not founded upon the Levitical priesthood. An argument to prove the sacerdotal character of the office of the Christian minister, drawn from the assumed sacerdotal character of the Jewish priest, breaks down if the Jewish priest is proved to have had no such distinction. To argue from the Levitical priesthood for the existence of a similar institution in the Christian Church, and to seek to prove the validity of the latter by an appeal to the former, on the assumption of their being exactly analogous, is surely most unwarrantable.

The ancient ritual having served its purpose, passed away. The Epistle to the Hebrews was written expressly for the purpose of showing that the whole system of sacrifices and offerings under the law has been for ever abolished by the one offering of Christ. So far from the Christian ministry being founded upon the Levitical priesthood, it would rather seem to stand in direct contrast with it, in some at least of its main features.

To claim for the Christian minister the status of a sacrificing priest, because it was one part of the office of the Levitical priesthood to offer up the sacrifices of the people, is virtually to exalt him to a higher position than Christ, *in reference to the law*. The writer to the Hebrews, chap. viii. 4, expressly asserts that "if Christ were on earth He should *not be a priest*," but, according to the contention, His *ministers are* priests!

There is, however, an analogy or agreement between the two ministers, as there is between the two Dispensations. This analogy is generally admitted. Not so, however, are the points of contrast and divergence.

We shall only glance at one striking feature of dissimilarity and contrast between the two Dispensations before proceeding to bring out to clear view the points of distinction between the two ministries.

The great peculiarity, then, of the worship of the Old Dispensation was this, that there was only one house on earth in which that worship could be acceptably offered. The woman of Samaria, rightly apprehending this, wished to know *where* that only acceptable place was, whether on Mount Zion or on Mount Gerizim? Her question drew from the Divine Teacher the intimation that henceforth regard would be had not to the place in which worship would be offered up, but to the spirit and character of the worshippers. As though He had said: Ask me not as to the proper place for worship, inasmuch as a great and momentous change is

impending. The Old Dispensation in which worship in an appointed house was an essential requisite is about to be dissolved; and when that has passed away, true and acceptable worship may be offered up in any and every place.

In perfect harmony with this great and fundamental contrast between the two Dispensations is the distinction between the ministries of each.

A few salient points of contrast will answer the purpose we have in view. Let us note then, first and carefully, that the Levitical priesthood was strictly limited to the family of Aaron, and to his descendants. That is, it was a ministry of a carnal order, or according to the flesh. And as if to present the *Christian* ministry in striking contrast with a carnal succession, the great Head and High Priest of our profession was not of the priestly tribe. The Levitical priest ministered by virtue of his relation to Aaron. The Christian minister serves by virtue of an inward call, and an anointing of the Holy Ghost. The Levitical priest ministered as a right which belonged to him by birth, the Christian minister by reason of a spiritual character and spiritual gifts.

Another mark of contrast, and a striking one, is in the offerings presented by the respective ministries. The sacrifices which the Levitical priesthood offered up were carnal and bloody. The sacrifices of the Christian minister pertain to the spiritual character and life and are themselves spiritual, even the praises of hearts renewed and sanctified.

Finally, the Levitical priest had no special Divine message to the people. He had no gospel to preach: no glad tidings to proclaim. When, in times of national apostacy or national calamity, the people needed warning or guidance or consolation, it was not to the priest that they looked for help. It was not their province, nor were they necessarily and by virtue of their office qualified to give it. Indeed, save in matters of mere ritual and ceremony, we scarcely find any trace of their influence throughout the whole course of Jewish history, except indeed in the latter and degenerate days which immediately preceded the destruction of the Jewish polity, and then their influence was for the most part only for evil. When any special interposition was needed on the part of God, by way of warning or instruction, *prophets* were raised up to make known the will of heaven, and it is to the prophet and not to the priest that we must look for the model, and the authority, and sanctions of the Christian ministry.

The Septuagint.

PROFESSOR GRAETZ'S REPLY TO PROFESSOR SWETE.

Professor Swete, the greatest authority on the Greek versions of the Old Testament, whose critical edition of the text of the Septuagint with various readings filled all those acquainted with the subject with admiration, has attempted to invalidate my argument, drawn from the text itself, for the approximate date of the oldest Greek translation of the Pentateuch (*vide* The Expository Times, 1891, p. 209). Starting from the circumstance that in a few verses of the Pentateuch the word מֶלֶךְ is not rendered literally in the Greek translation by *βασιλεύς*, but by the word *ἄρχων*, I had advanced the conjecture, that this seems to have been done out of regard to a Plotemaic king of Egypt, and that thereby the otherwise vague account, that the oldest Greek version of the Pentateuch was made under the auspices of such a king, is confirmed. Again, in the fact that the unambiguously clear expression, מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת, for the counting of the days between the Feast of Passover and Pentecost, is strangely rendered inaccurately by "from the morrow after the first" (day of the feast), I have conjectured that we may find an agreement with the equally erroneous interpretation of the Pharisees, and that thereby an approximate date for the origin of the Septuagint may be derived from the text itself (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1890). Professor Swete has attempted to weaken both these arguments; but, as it seems to me, without sufficient counter-evidence.

Against my first conjecture my antagonist adduces Gen. xxxv. 11, in which the word מְלָכִים is certainly rendered by *βασιλεῖς*, and not by *ἄρχοντες*, from which he concludes that the translator of the Pentateuch did not scruple to use the word "king." But this fact rather confirms my assumption. In opposition to me he might have adduced other three verses from the Pentateuch, in which the Hebrew word in question is likewise rendered literally. In Gen. xvii. 6 and 16, in the promise given to Abraham: "Kings shall come out of thee," the translation is *βασιλεῖς*. Further, in Gen. xxxvi. 31 (in the enumeration of the kings of Edom), in the chronological addition: "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel," the word in question is also rendered by *βασιλεύς*. This fact, which might have been used

against my conjecture, has not escaped my attention. I imagined, however, that attentive critics would not urge it against me.

For, is it not exceedingly surprising that precisely in these verses the corresponding word is used, whereas in others it is changed into ἄρχων? It is still more surprising that in all the verses without exception where heathen kings (*e.g.* the kings of Sodom, Edom, Moab, etc.) are spoken of, the word βασιλεύς is used without scruple for מֶלֶךְ. This circumstance alone would be sufficient to prove that the translation, ἄρχων, instead of βασιλεύς, in other verses, must have been employed deliberately.

Besides the verses treating of the choice of a king from among his fellow tribesmen, ἄρχων is used in the following passages. In Num. xxiii. 21: וּתְרוּעַת מֶלֶךְ בּוֹ — τὰ ἔνδοξα ἀρχόντων ἐν αὐτῷ; in Deut. xxxiii. 5: וַיְהִי בִישֻׁרוּן מֶלֶךְ — καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ ἄρχων. In this alteration it is difficult not to see design and tendency; and one can divine the tendency without much reflection. The word "king" is altered in the verses in which it might have raised the suspicion that the Israelites of the present were, according to the statements of their sacred book, looking for, desiring, dreaming of a king. So also in the verses: "the majesty of a king in their midst," or, "there will be a king in Jeshurun." It might also have been inferred from Deut. xxviii. 36: יוֹלֵךְ יהוה אֹתְךָ וְאֶת־מַלְכְּךָ, that the Israelites would see a king fall into captivity, if they did not remain faithful to the law. Accordingly it is altered into ἀπαγάγοι . . . καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου, οὓς ἂν καταστήσεις ἐπὶ σεαυτόν. On the other hand, in such verses as speak of a king of the *days of old* the corresponding word is retained.

It is not superfluous to call to mind that, if there is any historical reality in the alleged interest taken by an Egyptian king in the translation of the law-book sacred to the Israelites, this can only be Ptolemy Philometor, who showed extraordinary favour to the Israelites living in Egypt. Israelitish generals and Israelitish troops helped him to fight against his hostile brother. Philometor must, therefore, have put extraordinary confidence in the Israelites. They on their part had to avoid everything that would shake this confidence. The change in the translation seems to me to aim at avoiding the raising of the suspicion, by means of the sacred record, in the mind of this king, that the Israelites in Egypt were really clinging to a king out of their own midst, and that their loyalty was not to be trusted.

From this there follows the very opposite of the assertion of Professor Swete, that βασιλεύς and ἄρχων are used *promiscue* in the Greek version. The verses cited rather prove that the translator proceeded *fastidiously* and with *deliberation*, avoiding the word "king," wherever it might have roused suspicion, and using it, on the other hand, wherever offence might appear to be inconceivable. It is true that in the verse in the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 20), where it is said that Asshur will yield dainties for kings (the Septuagint has the plural), upon which my antagonist rests his argument, it might also have been rendered βασιλεῦσι. But the translator might have been of opinion: *in dubeis abstinentia*.

Professor Swete's objection to my second conjecture is not more valid. There was a dogmatic controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees with reference to the way of counting the days between the Passover and Pentecost, and in one passage the translator has rendered so as to favour the view of the Pharisees in glaring contradiction with the literal meaning of the words. From this I have concluded that the Greek version of the Pentateuch must have been made after the breaking out of the dogmatic difference between these two parties or sects. To this my antagonist replies, that the translation which deviates from the meaning of the words in favour of the Pharisaic interpretation may have been a later alteration. But when we consider that the version of the Pentateuch was used in divine worship at least in the Alexandrian προσευχαί, and that it had consequently attained to a kind of Koran-like authority among the Alexandrian communities, it is not conceivable that the original reading, which favoured the Sadducees in a matter of so great importance, should afterwards have been altered out of love to the Pharisees. A translation, which has been in use for a considerable time, one does not readily dare to change for a translation which is directly opposite. It would be a kind of falsifying of documents. Precisely because the translation of the expression מִמָּחֳרַת הַשַּׁבָּת by "from the morrow after the first day of the feast" (a translation which is still retained in all the Codices) does violence to the meaning of the words, it seems to be original. The translation of the same expression in another verse by "from the morrow after the Sabbath" may more readily be regarded as a *later* emendation, not in favour of either the one or the other of the two dogmatic views, but in order to do justice to the literal meaning of the words. It may derive from the translator of Codex Alexandrinus, from Hesychius or Lucian, in order that the version may be in accordance with the text. As regards the disputed point, whether the translation in ver. 11, or in ver. 15, presupposes a later hand, one's judgment must incline to the view, that the translation, which contradicts the meaning of the words, is far less likely to be a correction.

I beg my esteemed antagonist to weigh these arguments, and his critical tact and love of truth will admit their soundness.

Klostermann *versus* Kautzsch and Socin.

UNDER the above title, Canon Cheyne contributes the following note to the *Expositor* for August :—

In the interests of fairness, and to save some readers from useless expenditure of trouble, it may be noted that Professor Klostermann, the Don Quixote of criticism, who has been hailed in America as the discoverer of a new and better theory of the formation of Genesis, has not been left unanswered in Germany. I refer, on the one hand, to the excellent Kiel professor's "Contributions to the History of the Origin of the Pentateuch," in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for 1890 (Parts 9 and 10); and, on the other, to the preface to the new edition of Kautzsch and Socin's Documentary German edition of the Book of Genesis. Mr. L. B. Paton, in his laudably brief article on Klostermann's ambitious theory, in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for last April, omits all mention of what appears to Klostermann "the most manifest proof" of the justice of his condemnation of the criticism of Genesis as hitherto [for the last 140 years] practised. That proof is—the edition of Genesis published in 1888 by Kautzsch (whom we may perhaps venture to call the German Driver) and his eminent non-theological colleague, Socin. No wonder that Kautzsch and Socin were moved to reply: and their calm, conciliatory tone is a proof that they have no fear for their cause. Nor, in fact, need most of those who read the *Expositor* trouble themselves about Klostermann. Klostermann is, upon the whole, disappointing even as a text-critic (see Driver, *Samuel*, Preface, p. v), and it would be unwise in the extreme for non-experts to give much weight to his views on the higher criticism. Psychological probability can scarcely be conceded to a view which compels us to suppose that Gen. xxviii. 1–9 was written down as the continuation of chap. xxvii. And with regard to the so-called "prejudice of the identity of the text transmitted by the synagogue with the original form of the Torah," most English students will agree that it would be most unwise (judging from the revision of the text of Samuel and Kings given by Klostermann in Strack and Zöckler's Commentary on the Old Testament) to found the higher criticism of Genesis on a text revised by Klostermann. This thoroughly well-meaning but too self-centred worker is hurt because Kautzsch and Socin have appeared to him to claim that the analysis of the sources of Genesis is complete, and its results definitive. But, as a fact, the two analysts have been "honest enough to confess pretty often their ignorance." What they do assert is, that "the element which still remains, and *perhaps always will remain*, doubtful, stands in no relation to the large number of sections whose origin is certain, and which enable us to form a well-founded view of the character of the original documents, and the mode in which they were worked up together." It would be wiser far if Klostermann would recognise these results, and co-operate with those who would fain practise historical criticism of the sources of the Hexateuch upon sounder and more historical principles than those of some of our predecessors.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

1 COR. X. 13.

"There hath no temptation taken you but such as man can bear: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation make also the way of escape, that ye may be able to endure it" (R.V.).

EXPOSITION.

"*There hath no temptation taken you.*" This use of the verb "to take" (λαμβάνειν) in reference to fortunes, states, etc., which *seize upon* men, is very common in the classics.—*Meyer.*

The temptation had not only solicited, but seized and overcome them. It was now holding them fast.—*Edwards.*

"*Such as man can bear.*" Literally, "human" (one word, ἀνθρώπινος, in the Greek): within the limits of the spiritual powers God has given to men. We can conceive higher intelligences to be attacked by severer temptations.—*Agar Beet.*

"*But God is faithful.*" Or, "Yea, God is faithful," the conjunction (δὲ) having here not its ordinary oppositive force, but carrying on the reassurance, and adding the further and deeply consolatory thought that God would ever remain true to His promises.—*Ellicott.*

"*Above that ye are able.*" The words come as a surprise. Has man, then, some power? And, if the matter in question is what man can do with the Divine help, is not the power of this help without limit? But it must not be forgotten that if the power of God is infinite, the receptivity of the believer is limited: limited by the measure of spiritual development which he has reached, by the degree of his love for holiness, and of his zeal in prayer, etc. God knows this measure, Paul means to say, and He proportions the intensity of the temptation to the degree of power which the believer is capable of receiving from Him, as the mechanician, if we may be allowed such a comparison, proportions the heat of the furnace to the resisting power of the boiler.—*Godet.*

"*The way of escape.*" Simply, "the way out" (τὴν ἔκβασιν); properly, the way out of a defile or mountain pass.—*Edwards.*

EXEGETICAL NOTE.

The term πειρασμός, *proof, temptation*, comprehends all that puts moral fidelity to the proof, whether this proof have for its end to manifest and strengthen the fidelity (it is in this sense that God can tempt, Gen. xxii. 1; Deut. xiii. 3), or whether it seeks to make man fall into sin (it is in this sense that God cannot tempt, James i. 13, and that the devil always tempts). It may also happen that the same

fact falls at once into these two categories as, for example, the temptation of Job, which, on the part of Satan, had for its end to make him fall, and which God, on the contrary, permitted, with the view of bringing out into clear manifestation the fidelity of His servant, and of raising him to a higher degree of holiness and of knowledge. There are even cases in which God permits Satan to tempt, while consenting to his attaining his end of bringing into sin. So in the case of David, 1 Chron. xxi. 1 (comp. with 2 Sam. xxiv. 1). This is when the pride of man has reached a point such that it is a greater obstacle to salvation than the commission of a sin; God then makes use of a fall to break this proud heart by the humbling experience of its weakness. Such, undoubtedly, is the meaning in which we are to say: "Lead us not into temptation."—*Godet.*

METHODS OF TREATMENT.

I.

Temptation.

By the Rev. Charles Moinet, M.A.

Here we have the encouragement given to a Church that was sorely tempted to inconsistency and untruthfulness. This was the position on which they were to fall back, and within which they would always be secure. It consists of two lines of defence, both of which rest on a third. The first is, that none of our temptations, even the fiercest and most exceptional, will exceed our powers of endurance. The second is, that with every one there will also be provided a corresponding means of escape. And the guarantee by which both of these is made certain is the faithfulness of God.

1. None of our temptations exceed our powers of endurance. This does not imply that we shall always overcome when we are tempted, but it does imply that we always may. It will always be a hard thing to follow Christ. The opposition may change, but it will never slacken or withdraw. And not only without, but within the Church of Christ we find differences, even antagonisms; we find diversity of judgment about minor matters, suspicion and readiness to take offence, a charity that has never learned not to seek its own. But even in this there is ground of encouragement, if we understand what it means. We are all apt to suppose that there are difficulties in our path of a unique and exceptional kind. We are only meeting with temptations which in some shape every man must meet. We have the same promises and the same encouragements which every man enjoys. There hath no temptation taken us but such as man can bear.

2. With every temptation God will make a way of escape. This is but an application of the general law that Christ's grace is sufficient for us, and covers the whole extent of our need. He knows precisely the strength we need, because He has prepared the occasion on which we shall be called to use it. For you observe that He is said here to make the temptation as well as the way of escape. And the swiftest and most unforeseen temptations are all equally under His control. But how is it He makes a way of escape? Not by withdrawing the temptation, or divesting it of its force. This would be to defeat the very purpose for which He has sent it. He gives us strength to bear it.

3. The ground of encouragement on which both rest is, that God is faithful. He cannot be true to His purposes of grace and yet allow us to be overcome by the sheer weight and pressure of evil without a possibility of escape. For this purpose is that we may be saved from sin; and salvation from sin implies that we shall be strengthened against the temptations by which it seeks to prevail. Here is the source of consolation—God is never off His guard. Sin can lurk nowhere without being detected by His all-seeing eye. Moreover, it would be inconsistent with God's very nature were He to see us beaten down by temptation without interposing; for He has pledged Himself by the gift of His Son to leave nothing undone to give the final victory to good as against evil. His presence is, therefore, our guarantee of victory.

II.

"God is Faithful."

By the Rev. Wayland Hoyt, D.D.

From the bottom of the coal-mine, nearly a third of a mile deep, the whole weight of six tons, including coals and car, suddenly begins to shoot upward with such speed that it has reached the top and an empty car has descended in about a minute and a quarter. The motive power is the Belgian engine, and the presiding figure is the engineer. As well as cars of coal, precious human lives go up and down, and every miner's life depends on *him*. What is the steadying thought for these miners as they plunge into the darkness? It is that the engineer is *faithful*. Faithful! that means one who answers to trust, one who is true.

There are many dark things about life like the going down into the darkness of the mine—burdens, losses, anxieties, deaths, our own death. All in obedience to the laws of nature, men say. But who presides over these laws? What of Him? is the heart's cry. And the Scripture answer is, "God is faithful, He is true to trust."

He is true to trust whether we are conscious of the fact or not. But if we are conscious of it, there is great comfort for troubled souls in the fact. He will overrule *mistakes*. He will give strength amid *discouragements*. In the midst of *trial* He is present to prevent the weight overwhelming us. When

assurance fails He leads to the promise of assurance, and gives us a firm grip of His own sure word.

THOUGHTS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE apostle is here speaking not of temptation as it presents itself to the natural, but to the regenerate and converted man. The possibility of temptation lies, without doubt, in the same relations which he, as man, partakes with other men. Since, however, we have by faith become partakers of a power of resistance which the natural man does not possess, in him the temptation also takes the form of a conflict which in that manner is unknown to the natural man. And this is a conflict not merely between evil propensity and better will, but between that love to God which is born of faith, and the awakening of a love which draws him away from this power which has been bestowed on him by faith. And as he possesses in faith the power to overcome, so every temptation has for him the grave significance of an enticement to a renunciation of his faith.—*Harless: Ethics.*

THERE is a vast difference as to the way in which temptation affects a man, depending on the manner in which he deals with it,—whether he meets it with love, as an end to be sought, or tramples on it on the road to an aim beyond. "Can a man take fire in his bosom and not be burnt?" "When thou passest through the fire thou shalt not be burnt." There is a fire of purity and zeal in the heart that can make innocuous all flames of passion around.—*John Ker.*

IF you apply a magnet to the end of a needle that courses freely on its pivot, the needle, affected by a strange attraction, approaches as if it loved it. Reverse the order: apply the magnet now to the opposite end—to the other pole—and the needle shrinks away trembling, as if it did not love but hated it. So it is with temptation. One man rushes into the arm of vice; another recoils from them with horror. Joseph starts back, saying, "How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?" According as the nature it addresses is holy or unholy, temptation attracts or repels, is loved or hated.—*Thomas Guthrie.*

A YOUNG lady was walking down street one day, when she came near enough three young men to overhear the words addressed to one of them, "Come in and take a glass first, and you'll go along with us." Without a moment's hesitation she stepped forward, laid her hand on his arm, and said, "Excuse me, but please don't go with them." He turned in surprise, lifted his hat, and said, "Thank you, I won't." The crowd moved on, and the young lady was lost in it, but the way of escape was found for him.—*L. B. Lavely.*

I DELIGHT to behold the testimony which sin itself furnishes to man's greatness and immortality. I, indeed, see great guilt on earth, but I see it giving occasion to great moral strength and to singular devotion and virtue in the good, and thus throwing on human nature a lustre which more than compensates for its own deformity.—*W. E. Channing.*

IN order to avoid temptation, and to resist it when it has entered into us, the chief motto must not be, "This or that is in itself impure," but rather, "All things are ours, but we are Christ's." But, on the other hand, since the heart of a Christian needs a constant purification, the statement "To the pure all things are pure" does not become an opiate to the Christian, but rather a goad to his conscience. For precisely on that account he is careful, lest that which is in itself unobjectionable should become to him, in an objectionable state of mind, the source of a defiling pleasure.—*Harless: Ethics.*

THE Frenchman, imperfectly acquainted with the force of English words, and eager that extremest vengeance should be wreaked on certain human foes, cried aloud, "Kill them very often!" And *that*, as regards the worst enemies we have got, is precisely what we must do.—*A. K. H. Boyd.*

I'VE heard 'em say that horses that be stumblers be a'most sure to come down if you let 'em go along with a creepin' kind o' jog-trot. And that's how Christian folks fall in general; going along so slow an' sleepy, down they come all of a heap, knockin' themselves all to bits a'most before they know where they are. An' then troubles an' trials—of course, you do have them—heaps of 'em. What else can anybody expect? Slow an' sure! Why, 'tis 'xactly like when I be walkin' to Redburn on a fair-day, an' every van, an' cart, an' lumberin' waggon, an' donkeys, an' all the riff-raff an' sharpers, they do all overtake me. But when you do get in the train, you go whizzing over their heads, an' leave 'em behind, every one of 'em.—*Daniel Quorm.*

THERE is a very good story told of Sir Godfrey Kneller, in his character of a justice of the peace. A gentleman brought his servant before him upon an accusation of having stolen some money from him; but it having come out that he had laid it purposely in the servant's way in order to try his honesty, Sir Godfrey sent the master to prison.—*Boswell's Johnson.*

"AWEEL, aweel," said Lady Pitlyal, "as my auld friend, Lady Christian Bruce, was wont to say, 'The best way to get the better of temptation is just to yield to it;'" and as she nodded to the toast, and emptied the glass, Holmhead swore exultingly, "Gad, she's true!"—*John Brown: John Leech and other Papers.*

THE possibility of innocence being raised, through temptation, to holiness is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than in the beautiful creation which, like the genius of chastity, and all that is winsome in woman, has been, as it were, enshrined in "Measure for Measure," the play that so well expounds its own saying—

> "'Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus;
> Another thing to fall."

A. M. Fairbairn.

Messianic Prophecy.

Messianic Prophecy: its Origin, Historical Growth, and Relation to New Testament Fulfilment. By Dr. EDWARD RIEHM, late Professor of Theology at Halle. Second edition, translated by L. A. Muirhead, B.D. With an Introduction by Dr. A. B. Davidson. T. & T. Clark, 1891. 8vo, pp. i–xx, 1–348. Price 7s. 6d.

AMONGST "books which have influenced me," Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy* holds a place in the gratitude of many Old Testament students and scholars. Reading it again, after a lapse of fourteen years, in this greatly improved translation, one is surprised to find how large a part of one's working ideas on the subject appear to have been derived from Riehm, or suggested by him.

Not that the book is a finished or altogether satisfying one. It retains its original character of *Studies* on Messianic Prophecy. As Dr. Davidson intimates in his too brief preface there is a certain haze about the treatment; the subject is not as distinctly articulated as one could wish, nor the field of view always clearly defined. This defect, perhaps inseparable from the subject in the present state of knowledge, is very manifest in the *First Part*, on the "Origin of Messianic Prophecy," which is moreover weighted with a controversy against Hengstenberg and others, not of much interest to the English reader. But the *Second* and *Third Parts*, setting forth the historical relations of Prophecy and its New Testament fulfilment, are full of power and insight. Riehm does not deal largely in exposition or illustration, but mainly in discussion of principles and methods. He drives a clear path through the tangled thicket of Old Testament interpretation, which carries us not as far, perhaps, as we might desire, but for a considerable distance, and, above all, on firm ground. He disentangles the common confusion between prophecy and fulfilment, which makes a real understanding of the calling of Israel impossible, and lays apart the different strands woven together in prophecy itself. He makes us sensible of the continuous unity of prophecy and history. Underneath all special predictions and types, and behind the isolated texts on which dogmatic theologians have built often so precariously, we find a surer foundation in the prophetic structure and mission of Israel's whole religion, in the organic life of prophecy itself as a spiritual institution and discipline. We see how each prophet plants himself on the assured ground of former revelation, on the covenant that God had made with His people, and the promise of a final and perfect triumph of Jehovah's kingdom in Israel, and through Israel in the world; and how it was His task, for the sake alike of the present and the future, to set the events and the moral conditions of his own time, in their true relation to that past covenant and future kingdom. Thus we are brought into fellowship with the ancient people of God; and learn to recognise their rights in their own inspired teachers, that we may vindicate ours derived from theirs, and "*partake with them of the root* of the fatness of the olive tree."

The extracts which follow will give an idea of the spirit and style of Riehm's works:—

"If Messianic prophecy had shown the goal of the history of the kingdom of God in the long misty distance, wholly separated from the conditions and circumstances of the actual present, it would hardly have been able to exercise any influence upon those to whom it was in the first instance vouchsafed. Only by means of its times-coloured character, as above explained, could it fulfil its immediate design of directing the course of the prophet's contemporaries in present perplexities, of being to them a light enabling them to recognise the way in which God should lead His people in the present and the immediate future, *as one that conducted to the perfect consummation*. . . . If only the next piece of the road, leading to the next turning-point in the history of the Theocracy, were illumined by the light of the Divine purpose; and if men saw in the judgment actually on the way 'the Judge of the world ever in the act of coming,' and in the dawn of the immediately impending time of salvation and grace, 'the Saviour of the world ever in the act of coming,' the first receivers of the Messianic prophecies were fully in a position to pass their life in faith and obedience, in patience and hope, and in their own place work for the coming of the Kingdom of God" (pp. 173–74).

"The New Testament both sanctions and demands our distinguishing, in the prophetic oracle of the future imperial glory of Israel in His own land, between the Old Testament mode of representation and the eternal saving thoughts of God. The Israelitish descent of the Saviour of the world, the organico-historic connection of the New Testament people of God with Israel, the conservation of Israel's priority of claim to the promised salvation, serve as the historical fulfilment of the oracle, and attest it as one in harmony with the purpose of God. In so far, however, as it remains yet unfulfilled, it must, regarded in the light of the New Covenant and the New Testament word of God, be assigned, like other prophecies, to the realm of the typico-Messianic. It is in harmony with the Divine intention in the scheme of historical revelation that all the utterances of prophecy, which in their historical sense speak of the imperial glory of Israel in the last times, should be referred to the future glorious manifestation of the Church of Christ, the New Testament people of God, and the fact that pro-

phecy assigns the prospect of this glory to Israel is only an Old Testament veil of the Divine saving thoughts" (pp. 267–68).

"Messianic prophecy is not what the older supernaturalism imagined, essentially prediction of the individual concrete events of the New Testament record of fulfilment, but announcement—announcement in great measure in typical veil—of the eternal saving thoughts of God, which were to be accomplished in the New Covenant." . . .

Of the "external incidents" in which prophecy received a detailed fulfilment, Riehm says:—"Such coincidences are designed as finger posts, pointing to the deeper and essential fulfilment, as external holdfasts, aiding a still weak understanding, and attracting attention to the fulfilment of prophecy in such a way as to encourage a more penetrating investigation into the nature of the bond that unites these two correlates of historical revelation. Such was obviously the design of Christ in arranging His Messianic processional entry into Jerusalem, in literal conformity with the word of Zech. ix. 9" (pp. 309–11).

"We must use prophecy as the prophets themselves used the prophecies of their predecessors, not by way of discovering from them the hidden issues of particular events of their own time, or the immediate future, but by way of extracting from them the fundamental thoughts and laws of the Divine government of the world, and the fundamental features of God's sovereign plan, and of applying them to the circumstances of their own time. By such a use of prophecy they came, so to speak, to see the trend of actual events. If we follow the precedent they have set us, the Divine word of prophecy will yield us the service it is intended to yield; we have in it a sure standard of judgment applicable to the conditions, efforts, and movements of our own time. . . . We learn more and more to regard contemporary history in that light in which it also appears as part of the road that conducts us to the final goal of the ways of God" (pp. 317–18).

GEO. G. FINDLAY.

Robert Browning.

Robert Browning as a Philosophical and Religious Teacher. By HENRY JONES, M.A. Professor of Philosophy in the University College of North Wales. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons. Crown 8vo, pp. xii, 367. 1891. 7s. 6d.

OF the two most recent books on Browning, Mrs. Sutherland Orr's Biography and Professor Jones' Study, opinion is apparently irreconcilably at variance upon the one and just as unanimously in favour of the other. Our purpose at present is to let Professor Jones' book speak for itself. It has given us the keenest enjoyment, and although it does not by any means readily lend itself to quotation, we think it possible by means of a few sentences picked here and there to give some impression, if not of its clear thinking, at least of the beauty of its style.

The Poetry and the Philosophy of England.

There are not a few educated Englishmen who find in the poets, and in the poets alone, the expression of their deepest convictions concerning the profoundest interests of life. They read the poets for fresh inspiration, partly, no doubt, because the passion and rapture of poetry lull criticism and soothe the questioning spirit into acquiescence. But there are further reasons; for the poets of England are greater than its moral philosophers; and it is of the nature of the poetic art that, while eschewing system, it presents the strife between right and wrong in concrete character, and therefore with a fulness and truth impossible to the abstract thought of science.

> "A poet never dreams:
> We prose folk do: we miss the proper duct
> For thoughts on things unseen."[1]

Truth First.

Browning's way of poetry is, I think, fundamentally different from that of any other of our great writers. He often seems to be roused into speech, rather by the intensity of his spiritual convictions than by the subtle incitements of poetic sensibility. His convictions caught fire, and truth became beauty for him; not beauty, truth, as with Keats or Shelley.

Browning's Faith.

His work, though intuitive and perceptive as to form, "gaining God by first leap," as all true art must do, leaves the impression, when regarded as a whole, of an articulated system. It is a view of man's life and destiny that can be maintained, not only during the impassioned moods of poetry, but in the very presence of criticism and doubt. His faith, like Pompilia's, is held fast "despite the plucking fiend."

Art and Religion.

Now, this is just the soil where art blooms. For what is beauty but the harmony of soul and sense, a universal meaning caught and tamed in the particular? To the poet each little flower that blooms has endless worth, and is regarded as perfect and complete; for he sees that the spirit of the whole dwells in it. It whispers to him the mystery of the infinite; it is a pulse in which beats the universal heart. The true poet finds God everywhere; for the ideal is actual wherever beauty dwells. And there is the closest affinity between art and religion, as its history proves, from Job and Isaiah, Homer and Æschylus, to our own poet; for both art and religion lift us, each in its own way, above one-sidedness and limitation, to the region of the universal. The one draws God to man, brings perfection *here*, and reaches its highest form in the joyous life of Greece, where the natural world was clothed with almost supernatural beauty; the other lifts man to God, and finds this life good because it reflects and suggests the greater life that is to be. Both poetry and religion are a reconciliation and a satisfaction; both lift man above the contradictions of limited existence, and place him in the region of peace—where,

> "With an eye made quiet by the power
> Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
> He sees into the life of things."[2]

[1] *Fifine at the Fair*, lxxxviii. [2] *Tintern Abbey.*

Point and Illustration.

A Hair of Cotton-wool.

By the Rev. Hugh Macmillan, D.D., LL.D.

The Quiver, August.

You place under the microscope a single hair of cotton-wool, which to the naked eye is so fine as to be little more than visible. In this magnified fibre you see a peculiar twist, produced by its mode of growth in the cotton-pod. You would think that twist of no consequence or meaning, and yet it is by means of this peculiarity that the fibre can unite with other fibres, and form together a thread strong enough to be woven. Without this apparently accidental irregularity on the surface of a hair, it would be impossible to spin cotton thread, or to weave cotton cloth; and thus one of the staple manufactures of one of the greatest nations in the world would not have come into existence, and mankind would have lacked the principal material of their clothing.

Arrow Prayer.

By the Rev. C. A. Davis.

The Baptist Magazine, August.

We usually give it the longer and more awkward name of ejaculatory prayer. But what the Romans called "jaculum" is with us an arrow; and to our English ear the English word better describes the arrowy flight of the swift thought-appeal to God.

"Blessed be Jael."

By the Rev. J. Watson.

The Primitive Methodist Magazine, August.

In reading the story of Charlotte Corday, our sympathies are not drawn to her victim, the bloody Marat, but to the young Norman girl of "beautiful still countenance," who sacrificed herself, that she might rid her country of a monster of wickedness. "What tempted you to kill him?" her judges inquired. "His crimes," she replied with uplifted voice. "I killed one man to save a hundred thousand; a villain to save innocents; a savage wild-beast to give repose to my country. I was a Republican before the Revolution; I never wanted energy."

Pilate.

By the Rev. Canon Scott-Holland, M.A.

The Sunday Magazine, August.

There was nothing to signalise him; he was no bad example of an average Roman governor. In a few months he might have retired from his post, to end his days in the merciful obscurity which has closed over the remains of thousands such as he. But the pathetic tragedy of his life lies in this: that suddenly, by accident (as we speak), without any wish, or choice, or consent of his own, unasked, unwarned, surprised, he is found to be placed at the very hour and centre of the sharpest and fiercest crisis that the world has ever seen. The heat of the great battle surges with abrupt vehemence, with furious emphasis, round the spot where he happens to stand. It is the hour of all hours, and he is in the very thick of its awful pressure before he is aware of it, before he can take its measure. Unexpected, uncalculated, the eternal war has swung his way—the war between good and evil—God and devil—the death-struggle for the world's redemption. Round him the forces of the spiritual strife surge and swell. In a moment he is caught up into them, as into a whirlpool, round and round they eddy, they storm, they howl; they clamour for a decision from him—a decision swift, momentous, vital. "Yes or no."

"There go the Ships."

By the Rev. E. A. Stuart, M.A.

The Churchman's Magazine, August.

"There go the ships!" But whither do they go? Upon what voyage are they bound? and what will be the end of their voyage? I see what grand possibilities there are before you. You may go forth as men-of-war to distant lands. You may go forth only to be light-vessels, to warn mariners from a dangerous coast; or to be goodly merchantmen, bringing treasures from afar for the enrichment of your own souls and those among whom you live. What will be the end of your little voyage? When I think of the unseen reefs of temptation, of neglected leaks of little sins; when I think of those swift currents of public opinion; when I think of the storm and the tempest, I cannot help praying, as I once heard a chaplain pray at the launching of one of Her Majesty's vessels: "O God, defend all those who now or hereafter shall commit their lives on board this vessel to the perils of the deep."

Experience.

By R. W. Dale, LL.D.

The Christian Commonwealth, July 16, 1891.

Coleridge says somewhere that experience is like the stern-lights of a ship. It illuminates only the path over which we have travelled. I find that true. Every new year seems to bring new conditions of life, and I myself am also a new man. Precedents avail little. Experience may have done something to discipline one to meet fresh duties and fresh perils, but the raw material of one's past history is of little use.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kinneff, Bervie, N.B.

42,380

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room

OCMC